

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WHAT is it that makes us turn away so decidedly from the perfectionist? There is no doubt that perfection is demanded of us. It is demanded of every Christian man and woman. It is demanded by Christ. Whether the Sermon on the Mount was all spoken on one occasion or not, we recognize the words which close the first great chapter of it as its sum and substance: 'Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.'

Three elements enter into the antipathy. First, our dislike to a claim which we cannot ourselves make. Next, our inability to see that the claim is made good. And, thirdly, our conviction that 'freedom from known sin' is not the highest expression of the Christian life.

Now it must be evident to one who gives a little candid consideration to the matter that there is nothing in the first two objections. And if there is anything in the last it is due to a mistake which may at any time be rectified. We have no right to resent the claim to perfection which another makes, seeing it is demanded of us all; let us rise to the height of it. We have no right to doubt the validity of that claim, unless the manifest signs of sinfulness are thrust upon us. We have only the right to say to our perfect brother that he must see to it that he is perfect *as his Father which is in heaven is perfect*.

In what respect is the Father in heaven perfect? That question is asked by the anonymous author of a book entitled *How to Live the Victorious Life* (Marshall Brothers; 2s. 6d.). The author is a perfectionist. He writes the book in order to tell us so. And he is most particular to say that the perfection which he has reached is the perfection of the Heavenly Father.

How, then, is our Heavenly Father perfect? He answers, 'Surely in everything. But He is *God* and we are *men*. Jesus does not command us to be perfect as God. The Father is perfect in absolute sinlessness; in majesty, in glory, in power, in wisdom. Such perfection cannot be attained by mortal man. In what, then, are *we* to be perfect? "Be ye *therefore* perfect." That word "therefore" evidently refers to what has been said just before. What is that? Simply a command to be full of love. Godless men love their friends: the followers of Christ are to *love their enemies* as well. Our Lord is commanding perfect Love. This thought came to me with overwhelming power. The Victorious Life is simply a life of *perfect love*.'

So far well. Nor is it necessary for the author to prove that perfect love is enough. He proves it by quoting St. Paul's 'wonderful thirteenth chapter of 1st Corinthians.' 'Love is enough, for

"love suffereth long"—it drives away all impatience; "Love is kind"—it leaves room for no unkindness; "Love envieth not"—all jealousy is banished; "Love vaunteth not itself"—boasting and self-assertion disappear; "Is not puffed-up"—pride finds no place in the heart'; and on to the end of the chapter.

That is all very well and quite acceptable. The question remains, How am I to love? How am I to love perfectly? How am I to love as my Father which is in heaven loves? To that question also this unknown author has his answer. The answer is the meaning of his book.

We learn to love, he says, by receiving Christ into our hearts by faith. Nay, we do not need to learn; we love. We love at once, and perfectly, as soon as Christ by faith enters into our hearts to dwell there. *For the love which we then have is not our love, it is the love of Christ expressing itself in us and through us.* As St. Paul says, 'I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me,' so he might have said, and would have said had it occurred to him, 'I love; yet not I, but Christ loveth in me.'

There is a brave metaphor used in the Old Testament of the indwelling of the Spirit of God in a man. It occurs first of all, and of all places, in the Book of Judges. The metaphor is that the Spirit of God clothes itself with the man's personality. The phrase in the Authorized and Revised Versions is 'came upon'—'the Spirit of the Lord came upon Gideon' (Jg 6³⁴); but the margin of both versions gives the meaning accurately—'the Spirit of the Lord clothed itself with Gideon.' When the Spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ clothes itself with a Christian believer that man loves and is perfect as his Father which is in heaven is perfect.

When St. Paul wrote his first letter to the Christians in Corinth he found himself faced with the fact that Christianity had made little progress

among educated people. He explained the fact by saying that they had not been called. It may be that he even said, as the margin of the Revised Version suggests, that they had no part in the Gospel. But we may be sure that he was not indifferent. For it was indifference on their part that made them miss their opportunity. And the last thing that a preacher can be indifferent to is indifference.

The time came, though scarcely in the lifetime of the Apostle, when the educated Greek or Roman could no longer be indifferent to the preaching of Jesus and the Resurrection. Then arose the apologist. For as soon as the Gospel demanded attention from the scholar, it roused his opposition and received his criticism. Two movements now were seen together. The Gospel was still preached to the ignorant, and the ignorant received it gladly; Christianity was vindicated before the learned, and the learned disputed in the school of Tyrannus or another, and went on writing commentaries on Plato and Aristotle.

And since that day both movements have proceeded side by side, while the results have been ever the same. We see them most unmistakably in India. The outcastes are gathered in by the thousand: the learned Brahmin disputes and denies and endeavours to raise his ancient philosophy to life again. The temptation is strong to leave the wise to their wisdom.

But it must be resisted. And never in all the history of Christianity more hopefully than now. Great teachers, as Ward and Sorley and Pringle-Pattison, who some ten or twenty years ago, would have emphasized the distinction between philosophical and Christian ethics, have drawn very near to the teaching of Christ. The opportunity has been seized by the Rev. W. R. MATTHEWS, Professor of the Philosophy of Religion in King's College, London, to commend to the wise, to the Scribe, to the disputer of this world, the Gospel of the grace of God.

If the Gospel is to be commended to the philosopher, it must be commended philosophically. And so, in issuing his book entitled *Studies in Christian Philosophy* (Macmillan; 12s. net)—it is the Boyle Lectures for 1920—Professor MATTHEWS says: 'My main object in these lectures has been to suggest that Christian doctrine rests upon a few simple affirmations of a philosophical character, and to indicate a line of thought which seems to lead to the conclusion that these affirmations are rational.'

The question is of the interpretation of the world. For if it is the business of poetry to interpret life, it is the business of philosophy to interpret the universe. 'Why does the world as we experience it exist, and what is its significance and the meaning of life? That, as I suppose, is a question which is devoid neither of import nor of importance. It is in fact, as I believe, the main-spring of all philosophical inquiry.'

And Mr. MATTHEWS believes that no hypothesis other than the Christian one has any answer to give to that question. In most cases, he says, the impotence is confessed. In some cases it is disguised under a denial that the question has any relevance. Christianity alone has an answer. What is it?

The answer is that 'the world exists because it was created by the love of God. Its purpose is to educate and fashion finite spirits, through free effort, into the status of children of God; to bring them to a condition of intellectual and moral development such that they may enjoy that complete communion with God which is the consummation of their being, and may form that community which, by the harmony of the selves with one another and with their Creator, constitutes the Kingdom of God.'

'Constitutes the Kingdom of God.' But what is that? The philosopher is at fault at once. He is not familiar with the phrase. He does not know

its meaning. For we have never yet been able to introduce 'the Kingdom of God' into our speech—not into our philosophical and not even into our familiar speech. There are few facts more puzzling than that. Even Professor MATTHEWS, Dean of his College and Bachelor of Divinity, is not at home with the phrase. He rarely uses it. When he arrives at the place where he has to tell the philosopher what the Kingdom of God is, and to prove its superiority to all other ways of interpreting the world, he drops it altogether and uses the expression 'Christian Civilization' instead.

Why have we not been able to naturalize the Kingdom of God? The sensitive Republican may be shy of the word 'kingdom.' For a kingdom involves a king; and here the King is supreme and all-determining. But that is not the reason. It is due to religious reticence. It is due to the religious reticence of our spoken and our written language. And reticence is often indistinguishable from cowardice. We should have welcomed from so outspoken and accomplished a writer as Professor MATTHEWS a steady adherence to the heroic word.

But he does not use it. He uses 'Christian Civilization' instead. And no doubt he can offer reasons for his choice. His purpose is to prove the superiority of the Christian to all other types of culture, and the phrase 'Christian Culture' or 'Christian Civilization,' he may say, enables him to make the comparison with least misunderstanding or offence. In what, then, does Christian Culture show its superiority?

First in this, that it is progressive. 'The illustration of this property which occurs most readily to our minds is the scientific advance which has revolutionised life and thought during the last hundred years; but this is neither the most important nor the most fundamental aspect of the phenomenon. Social organisation and social ideals have shown the same character. Compared with all other civilisations, Christendom

has possessed a freedom of adaptation and a forward impulse which is without parallel.'

But the fact of progress is not the most important thing. Greater is the idea of progress. 'We are apt,' says Mr. MATTHEWS, 'to overlook the uniqueness of the idea of progress because it has entered so intimately into the constitution of our minds, so that we are scarcely able to imagine a civilisation in which it does not exercise a like influence. Yet a comparison with the ancient civilisations and with the still existing cultures of China and India is sufficient to establish the fact of the difference on which we have been dwelling. Great as are the debts which we owe to the thought of Greece, the idea of progress is not among them. Let us quote a few words from one who will not be suspected of underrating the Greek legacy to humanity. "That a single principle or will lies at the root of nature, and is also embodied in the mind and actions of man, is the inspiring conviction of every progressive society, as of all science and practical energy. We can hardly realise the depth of the change by which this Christian doctrine initiated the belief in development, so characteristic of the modern world, unless we compare the timid social ideas of the wisest of the Greeks with the audacious metaphors which were the first that occurred to the Galilean peasant. . . . The future is quite differently regarded, not as the painful preservation of equilibrium, but as a free and natural growth towards perfection. . . . For almost the first time in the world's history the golden age is transferred to the future.'" The quotation is from Professor Bosanquet's *Civilization of Christendom*.

Again, Christian culture is superior to all other in that it is characterized by 'enlarging unity.' For 'Christian civilisation has exhibited an unexampled power of assimilating various nations and races and, while preserving their individual characters, organising them into some sort of whole. It is true that every civilisation which

has been able to survive for any considerable period must have had some unifying power within it; and it is certainly remarkable that this unifying power has been the existence of a common view of life expressed in a common religion. In a wide sense it is true that the formation of society is due to religion, and the continuity of social existence is conditioned by the continuity of religious beliefs. But though other civilisations have had the faculty of preserving self-identity through a long period and through many changes, not one has approached the capacity which Christendom has shown of integrating an ever more complex material.'

'A third characteristic of Christian culture is the development within it of the ideals of political freedom and equality. As a conscious movement the battle for freedom has doubtless been associated with a revolt against dogmatic religion; but the rebels themselves have drawn their strength from the same social culture as that against which they protest. It is a fact that Christian civilisation alone has produced the democratic social ideal.'

A great deal of confusion, says Mr. MATTHEWS, has been 'caused by the habit of describing some of the slave-states of ancient Greece as democracies; but it is clear that a social system which rests on a class of forced labourers is quite different from what in modern language we mean by democracy. It is, of course, true that perfect democracy has never existed anywhere; but the idea of it has never dawned upon the minds of men except within the sphere of influence of Christianity. It is destined, as every one can see, to be a dominant conception in the future. "The law," St. Paul said, "was a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ, and the Christianity of eighteen hundred years has been a schoolmaster to bring men to freedom.'" The quotation is again from Professor Bosanquet.

A fourth, and last, feature of Christian culture is its characteristic type of humanism. 'Only

within Christendom has the idea taken root that human personality as such is worthy of reverence and possesses rights. Compared with this the humanism of the great period of ancient civilization was narrowly limited and hardly contained the thought of the value of humanity as such. To Plato and Aristotle the slave and barbarian are almost outside the sphere of interest, forming, as it were, an intermediate species between the Greek and the beast. Even Plato's ideal city is a system of castes in which the highest activities, those that are truly and characteristically human, are reserved for a strictly limited few. It is not until the rise of the Stoic philosophy that we come across a belief in the common dignity of all members of the human race. In modern Christendom the humanistic spirit has taken a dominant place in the social conscience.

In the month of July a 'Catholic Bible Congress' was held at Cambridge. The occasion was the fifteenth centenary of St. Jerome, and the purpose was to encourage the study of the Bible. For in his day St. Jerome gave the Bible to the people in their own tongue, just as Luther and Tindale did in their day; and the Roman Church now desires to encourage the people to read the Bible. The addresses delivered at the Congress have been published by Messrs. Heffer of Cambridge, with the title of *The Religion of the Scriptures* (3s. 6d. net). The motto of the book is a quotation from St. Jerome's writings—'Ignoratio Scripturarum ignoratio Christi est.'

Of the first address, delivered at the Congress and published in the book, two authors are given, the Rev. J. P. Arendzen, D.D., M.A., and the Rev. R. Downey, D.D., both of the Catholic Missionary Society, London. We are not told in what way they collaborated, and it does not matter. Their subject was inspiration.

Now the doctrine of the inspiration of the Bible has been so severely handled of late that we can

scarcely be sure if there is a doctrine left, and for the most part we have lost interest in it. Not so these men. To them it is a real thing, even if not a perfectly intelligible thing. It is in the first place *unique*, differing not in degree but in kind from the inspiration of Shakespeare. And in the second place it is Biblical, being the inspiration not of the writers whose writings are found in the Bible, but of the Bible itself. It is the Bible itself that is inspired, and every word of it.

So there are no mistakes in the Bible. None. 'Inspiration necessarily involves the absolute veracity of every statement of the Bible; for as God wrote it, and God cannot lie, the Bible cannot contain error of any kind.' So they say. And again: 'Though we do not hold verbal inspiration in the sense that the words were directly supplied to the human author by God, nevertheless God is immediately responsible for, and acknowledges as His own, the whole of the Scriptures and every word of it, so that we cannot say either that now and then words or sentences slipped through which were uninspired and merely human, or that the words are human and only the underlying thoughts divine. The ultimate result of inspiration is the written book, not the internal thoughts of the writer.'

It follows—and they have no hesitation in drawing the conclusion—that no part of the Bible is more or less inspired than any other part. Second Maccabees belongs to the Bible of the Roman Church. Very well: 'the Fourth Gospel and II. Maccabees are equally inspired.'

It follows, further, that no text in the Gospels or elsewhere can be better attested than another text. Does the prayer on the Cross, 'Father, forgive them,' occur only in St. Luke, or the formula of Baptism only in St. Matthew, or does the text which means so much to the Church of Rome, 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church,' occur only in the First Gospel?—that is not of the least importance, 'for the complete

weight of divine authority is at the back of every text in St. Matthew on account of its inspiration.'

That is a doctrine of inspiration indeed. Perhaps it is wise not to look more closely into it. But these two theologians, who have no desire to do that, find one or two difficulties even on the face of it. Thus they are sufficiently in touch with modern thought to realize that the narrative of the Creation in the very first chapter of the Bible cannot be taken as literal history. They do not say how they take it, but they prepare for some other way by saying that the 'complete' inerrancy of Scripture does not of necessity imply that every statement must be taken in a literal sense, and as true in that literal sense.'

They are also a little disturbed over 'the prodigiously long ages of the Patriarchs.' How do they meet that difficulty? 'Some fact,' they say, 'not merely a moral or philosophical idea—underlies them. Above all they are not merely childish folklore to fill up gaps of unknown history. But what that fact is the Church has never authoritatively settled. At present we seem to have lost the key to those enormous numbers, perhaps we are on the eve of rediscovering their meaning through the finding of the lists of the Babylonian or Sumerian antediluvian Patriarchs corresponding not in sound, but in meaning apparently to the biblical names. If once we could ascertain what they conveyed to Abraham and his tribe, who came from Ur in the Chaldees, we would have solved the riddle.'

Whereupon follow the last words of the address: 'Thus Catholic scholarship will go on with utmost freedom, yet in utmost security, ever venturing farther out into the ocean because never severed from the Rock on which Christ built His Church, ever forward, yet in utmost safety, for the Infallible Interpreter of the Bible is always on the alert and living and teaching in the bark of Peter.'

One of the addresses contained in the volume just noticed was delivered by the Rev. Ronald A. Knox, son of the late Bishop of Manchester. Mr. Knox, it will be remembered, recently entered the Church of Rome and afterwards gave his reasons for the step. On that account, and still more on account of his own personality, his address must have been looked forward to with exceptional interest.

Its subject is the Church. The first few sentences must have been a disappointment. He says that in order to defend the Roman doctrine of the Church 'it is necessary to prove in the first place that our Divine Lord meant to leave behind Him an organized body of followers, and in the second place that He meant to leave that body organized in a particular way, and not in any one of a dozen different ways which have been proposed or adopted as rival interpretations.' He then says that his purpose is to defend the doctrine of the Church not in the second sense but in the first. In other words, he is to prove that Christ meant to leave behind Him a Church, but not that He meant to leave the Roman Church. We need not therefore consider the lecture further. But three things were said in the course of it which are worth a moment's attention.

The first is a very surprising thing. Mr. Knox was at one time a Fellow of an Oxford College. Yet he says that 'the rejection of the Jews as a race, and their displacement (in large measure) in favour of the Gentiles under the New Dispensation is the secret of nearly half the parables.' You wonder which parables. He does not leave you wondering. 'The Jew,' he says, 'is the son who undertakes to work in the vineyard and does not; the Gentile is the one who refuses and then relents. The Jew is the elder son who has never left his Father's house; the Gentile the prodigal who is welcomed (it seems so unfairly) on his return home. The Jew is the early-hired labourer, who has borne the burden of the day and the heat; the Gentile, called at the eleventh hour, is made equal to him.'

The Jew is the rich man who fares sumptuously every day, and, though he has Moses and the prophets, has not learned to believe; the Gentile is the beggar who seeks to feed on the crumbs that fall from the rich man's table, "and no man gave unto him," the very same phrase that is used of the prodigal. The Jew is the invited guest who accepts the invitation and then cancels his acceptance; the Gentile is called in from the highways and the hedges. The Jew is the Pharisee who thanks God that he is not as other men are; the Gentile is the repentant publican who goes home justified. The Jewish people are the fig-tree which, fruitless, still cumber the ground; even now the Gardener of Gethsemane is praying that one more chance may be given to them. The Jewish people are the unfaithful husbandmen who are to murder the King's Son: the Gentiles are those "other husbandmen" to whom the vineyard will be given.'

It is a pretty long list. And a pretty amazing one. For it is as certain as anything in the interpretation of the Bible that the Gentiles are not once thought of in any of these parables.

How could they be? What occasion Jesus had to come in contact with Gentiles during His ministry in Galilee, in Samaria, or in Judæa we do not know. Thrice only are Gentiles definitely mentioned in the whole course of His ministry—two men and a woman. And on the occasion of His contact with the woman His attitude of aloofness was such that it has been a painful perplexity ever since, and has to be carefully scrutinized to find the essential meaning of it. On that occasion also He uttered the words, 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.'

That He created a gospel, good for the Gentile as for the Jew, there is no doubt. But neither is there any doubt that He left His disciples to offer it to the Gentiles. During His own lifetime He had to do with a division among the Jews themselves, which was as flagrant as the division be-

tween the Jews and the Gentiles, and much more fundamental—the division between the righteous and the sinners. That was enough to occupy Him, and it occupied Him entirely. It determined the whole method of His ministry. And every one of the parables referred to by Mr. KNOX has to do with it.

How can Mr. KNOX ignore the circumstances under which the parables were written? Take the best known of them all—the Parable of the Prodigal Son. Says St. Luke: 'Then drew near unto him all the publicans and sinners for to hear him. And the Pharisees and scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them. And he spake this parable unto them.' Then follow the three parables of the Lost Coin, the Lost Sheep, and the Lost Son without further introduction to any of them. Whether they were all spoken at the same time or not, it is quite certain that they were spoken under the same circumstances. We have often felt that this division among the Jews is not sufficiently recognized—it is clearly enough recognized by modern Jews who write on the Gospels—but we never expected to find a scholar like Mr. KNOX unconscious of it.

The second thing is more difficult. It is the meaning of the sentence, 'Many are called, but few chosen.' Here Mr. KNOX is less to be blamed, for he adopts the usual interpretation: 'Many are members of the Church, but few are true members.' Even here, however, he soon goes his own mistaken way. For his argument is that the visible Church on earth is the only Church. The idea of an invisible Church is abhorrent to him. Therefore this Visible Church, which is, of course, to him the Church of Rome, is the true Body of Christ. What the sentence means, then, is that only a few of those who make up the true Body of Christ really belong to it—a conclusion which is pretty nearly absurd.

But what does the sentence mean? 'Many are

called,' that is, invited. We ought to think at once of the marriage feast. Many were called to it—it is the Gospel invitation. But few accepted the invitation. And when they did not accept the invitation, our Lord did not say that they had not accepted it, He said that they were not *worthy* of it: 'The wedding is ready, but they which were bidden were not worthy.' He looked at the matter from the side of God. They refused the invitation, but that meant that God refused them. It is the same manner of speech as we find, and are so puzzled by, in the case of Pharaoh. As it is said that God hardened Pharaoh's heart, while we know very well that Pharaoh hardened his own heart, so here it is said that God chose or elected the few, but it was just the few who accepted the invitation.

The third thing is the most mysterious. Mr. KNOX comes to the words of the Institution of the Supper: 'This is my body: this is my blood.' He takes them literally of course—'this bread is my actual body; this wine is my actual blood.' But notice how he persuades himself.

He says that when Jesus 'uses allegory, the idea which He treats allegorically is the predicate of the sentence, not its subject; "I am the Way," "I am the Good Shepherd," "I am the true Vine." This habit of speech might cover such a phrase as "I am the living Bread," and an allegory might exhaust its meaning. But it quite certainly does not cover the phrase "This (*i.e.* that which I hold in My hands) is My Body." "This which is being poured out for you is My blood."'

The Sexcentenary of Dante's Death.

BY THE REVEREND J. P. LILLEY, D.D., EDINBURGH.

AT the news of a celebration like that of the sexcentenary of Dante's death (Sept. 14, 1321–1921), one readily calls to mind the old saying enshrined in the maxims of the Book of Ecclesiastes (ch. 7¹): 'Better is the day of death than the day of one's birth.' The proverb runs counter to our ordinary human feeling. The day of birth appears to be better than the day of death, because it is the beginning of the time when the cup of life is put into our hands. But when death arrives, the contents are drained and, in the phrase of Omar Khayyám, the glass is turned upside down.

On the other hand, who can miss the profound truth that lies in the heart of the paradox? Let a life be spent in harmony with the will of the Divine Parent of the universe and death shall be only the entrance into a new and stainless existence in a more congenial and enduring sphere than earth affords. In truth, death itself shall then be just our final birth into a higher, though at present unseen, world, in which all that is richest in the old life shall be conserved and beautified and immeasurable opportunities of grander progress developed.

Clear it is at least that the death of a great

writer is the most appropriate standpoint from which his work should be estimated. For then his achievement is complete. The seed has been sown and the harvest ripened and reaped. All that is needed is to beat out and grind the grain and then adjudge its quality as a part of human nature's daily food.

The people of Italy, therefore, carried with them the full sympathy of every cultured nation, when in the middle of September last they joined in appraising the work of one of the four greatest poets which Europe has produced. We also can rejoice with them in finding that after long tracts of years, in which his writings were misunderstood and neglected, Dante Alighieri has come into his kingdom, and will henceforth abide in it not only as the foremost man of letters in the history of Italy but as one of the great teachers of the human family. With an enthusiasm that does them infinite credit, the people of Ravenna, where Dante spent so much of his exile from Florence, began a full year ago to study his works afresh and make arrangements for commemorating his death; and all the tidings that have reached us go to show that this example has now been

followed in every other city of Italy, in some cases even on a larger scale. No poetic work has been more carefully studied and commented upon than Dante's has been in Italy; and now the whole population of the land calls upon other nations to claim the fruit of their labour and quaff the vintage they bring to our lips.

Happily it cannot be denied that the English-speaking races have taken a foremost place in yielding to Dante the honour he deserved. England can point with pride to the studies of his works made by writers like T. B. Macaulay, Paget Toynbee, Edmund Gardner, Edward Moore, D. G. Rossetti, E. H. Plumptre, J. A. Symonds, and Philip Wicksteed; and also to the encomiums of poets like Milton, Coleridge, Byron, Wordsworth, and Shelley. Scotland can recall the studies of Dr. John A. Carlyle and his more famous brother Thomas, and make honourable mention of such later expositors as Dr. J. S. Carroll; while from America we have the valuable contribution of J. R. Lowell and C. A. Dinsmore, and the translation in verse of H. W. Longfellow, and in prose of Charles E. Norton. Indeed, as Benedetto Croce, Italy's most eminent philosopher, has said, the work of exposition and comment has been well-nigh completed. What is needed now is that, with the best available helps at hand, the cultured students of literature should everywhere begin to enjoy the poetry of Dante itself and let its full intellectual, moral, and spiritual influence tell upon their minds and hearts.

It is as a slight contribution to this special object that I venture to offer this paper to my fellow-readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. On the details of Dante's life I need not dwell: they have been long familiar to us all. I am not so sure, however, that the leading purpose of his great poem, the *Divina Commedia*, has always been fully discerned even by diligent readers; and I hope that I shall not be regarded as attempting a work of supererogation if I devote the rest of this paper to the removal of one or two sources of misunderstanding and to a brief consideration of some of the main points in its spiritual teaching.

I.

One of the first stumbling-blocks to be overcome in reading the *Commedia* is found in the very name it bears. Why, it is asked, should a poem dealing with a theme so serious be known

as a 'Comedy'? Dante regarded this question as important enough to be anticipated and answered by himself in a Latin letter to his friend Can Grande. Here he tells us that the original title of the poem was *Incipit Comædia Dantis Alighieri, florentini natione non moribus*. The epithet *Divina*, therefore, must have become attached to it by admirers of the poem in later years to mark their view of its noble literary qualities and its potent influence as an apocalypse of the grace of God. It is called a Comedy, he goes on to point out, to exclude the idea of Tragedy. The latter word, derived from the Greek words for a goat (*τράγος*) and a song (*ᾠδή*), always denotes a work which, however calm and pleasant in its commencement, ends in a fashion that is repulsive and horrible. Comedy, on the other hand, derived from the word for a villa (*κώμη*) and the same word for a song, starts with what is harsh in its theme but reaches a happy ending. 'In like manner,' he adds, 'these two poems differ in their style of speech. Tragedy is couched in language that is exalted and sublime: comedy is a mode that is restrained and humble. Hereby it becomes plain why the present work is called a comedy: for from a beginning, awful and repellent as in the *Inferno*, it proceeds to an end as in the *Paradiso*, that is happy, desirable, and welcome.'¹

Even those who are prepared to accept this explanation of the title and style of the poem, however, are not so ready to fall in with its elaborate pictures of the localities in which the stages of Dante's pilgrimage are set. Why, it is argued, should one have to traverse such an intricate piece of external mechanism to gain an insight into his meaning? The answer is to be found in a fuller recognition of what was in the age of Dante a very widespread method of teaching spiritual truth. The mediæval mind was pervaded by an overmastering sense of the value of allegory, especially in poetry. The kindred arts of painting and sculpture gloried in presenting spiritual ideas in scenes and accompaniments that caught the eye and stimulated the imagination. The very tessellated pavements which the feet of worshippers trod in many churches were laid out with this object in view; and the poet could so little afford to ignore the prevailing fashion that he too must needs adopt for his thoughts a local

¹ *Le Epistole*, xi. p. 516 (Fraticelli).

fabric that in its main parts as well as in its minute details should harmonize with the spiritual lessons he intended to give. This kind of material Dante found ready to his hand in the cosmography that was widely accepted in his day; and he had only to supply from his own vivid fancy what the ordinary scheme might seem to lack, to rear a structure in which his great poetic soul could have ample room and verge enough to receive every single truth he desired to suggest to his reader's mind. I feel sure that this simple explanation will be helpful to all who, like men that cannot see a wood for the trees, find their thoughts hampered by the multitudinous pictures of places which the poem contains. Like the elaborate details of a vast Gothic cathedral, every one of them will be found to be a starting-point of some spiritual idea the poet longs to show.

But why, it may still be urged, should the poet have recourse to the world of the unseen and eternal for the material of his representations? Is not our own visible and tangible sphere of existence on earth interesting and symbolic enough to afford material suggestive of all the lessons we need for our guidance through the labyrinth of life? Dante evidently thought otherwise: and not without good reason. The present, which is so near to us, often acts as a veil which hides the real meaning and issues of our actions from the heart and conscience. The world around us presses so strongly and continuously on our attention that it prevents our giving due heed to what is going on in the unseen world of our own spirits. Human experience holds out to us so much that is pleasant and soothing even in the midst of wrong-doing that we fail to win a clear vision of the reality of sin and its hatefulness in the sight of God. Its exceeding sinfulness as essentially selfish rebellion against His creative and parental Love is hid from our eyes. Hence also the worth and method of penitence and the triumph of a new life in communion with God are too apt to be overshadowed and obscured. To see these great truths in their naked reality we have to go to the future, where the harvest of our present life on earth is reaped, and, guided by the teaching of Heavenly Wisdom, survey them now, as we are to see them there, in the light of God's Spirit and Word. It is because Dante undertakes to help us in gaining this clearer vision throughout the three parts of his poem that he has rendered

such priceless service to the spiritual life of humanity.

Whence, then, it may be said, did the poet himself gain the vision he displays? There is but one answer: it came to him as the result of deep personal experience. Dante does not give any formal description of his own entrance into the kingdom of heaven. He has not, like so many eminent Christian writers, left us any letters or hymns expressing directly the rapture of his spirit as he stepped into intimate communion with God. It is with extreme paucity of words and even under the veil of allegory that he alludes to the great change that swept over his spirit. Yet there cannot be the shadow of doubt that he did pass through the strait gate. The *New Life* (*Vita Nuova*), which he wrote as the introduction to the *Divina Commedia*, is not, as some have suggested, to be rendered his 'early career,' but rather as, in the Biblical sense of the words, the higher Christian life which sprang from a veritable new birth of the soul.

This 'conversion,' as E. H. Plümptre did not hesitate to call it, may have been very gradual; but it reached one marked stage after the death of Beatrice, and, after his exile from Florence, it rose to a climax that left his soul irradiated with the light and love that flow from the heart of God. It was this gracious experience that made the *Commedia* such a drama of the soul of man and so rich an apocalypse of the way by which alone he can reach his goal in the bosom of the Father. The Lord and Master of us all said that, when His Spirit came into the world, He would convict our fallen race in respect of sin and righteousness and judgment.¹ In the three divisions of his poem, Dante indirectly shows how he himself had passed through this process, and vindicates the necessity of its repetition in every one who would be fully saved now, even as in the great day. Indeed, in its essence, the poem is a spiritual autobiography, a record of Christian experience as real as that of Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* or even *Grace Abounding*; and therefore practically an abiding invitation to all its readers to face the same pregnant crisis and win the same crown.

II.

In the light of these explanations, the real aim of the *Commedia* becomes clear. The three parts of it shine each with its own lustre.

¹ Jn 16⁸⁻¹¹.

What is the *Inferno*, for example, but simply a drama of the soul under the conviction of sin? The very form of it is suggestive of the depths of evil. For the abyss is in the shape of an inverted cone reaching down into the depths of the earth. In the various circles that surround it are imprisoned the souls of the impenitent wicked; and there they undergo suffering proportionate to the kind and gravity of the special offences that stained their character on earth. In Dante's thought, the whole picture of the eternal future is fitted to exhibit 'Man as in the exercise of free will making himself by good or ill desert liable to the justice of reward or of punishment.'¹ Hence, and with special reference to the *Inferno*, no man can be regarded as being fully saved, unless he is cherishing a deep conviction of the reality and heinousness of sin as antagonism to the will of God and thereby also of the certainty of retribution in proportion to the nature of offences.

The specific form of sin mentioned by Jesus, namely, refusal to believe in Himself, is included by Dante under the head of heresy. The arch-heretics are assigned to a degraded circle (the sixth) between those of the incontinent and the malicious. It is to these that 'the Messenger of Heaven,' whom I cannot but regard as the Lord of all the angels Himself, says, as He said to Saul at Tarsus:

Why broods this arrogance in you? Why lift
The heel against the Holy Will, whose end
Not all your force can thwart, while many times
The pain your struggle wakes more keen becomes.²

This is a lesson, the poet held, that like himself men should learn now and in all time. Dante illustrates it by a long train of instances from the fate of men and women of whom he had read, and even of not a few whom he had known personally in this world. There he saw them, each in the appropriate circle, bearing the due penalty of wilful disobedience. In certain cases as, for example, that of Filippo Argenti, the punishment seems so severe that some critics of this part of the poem have accused Dante of callousness and even personal bitterness towards the victims of sin: but without sufficient reason. Dante has a great lesson to teach, and he will spare no pains to have it engrained on the conscience of his readers. When a master of surgery appears in the operating theatre

with a resolute air and carries out his task with perfect coolness, there are sure to be some pupils who imagine that he is devoid of feeling. But if they saw their teacher in his home after a day of such work, worn out and exhausted by the very effort of repressing his sympathy while trying to save a precious life, they would feel bound to revise their impression. It is thus we should think of Dante. He had 'the scorn of scorn' and 'the hate of hate' in relation to sin because he was in full harmony with the mind of God; but he had also 'the love of love' for his fellow-offspring. As Thomas Carlyle insisted, no tenderer heart than Dante's ever beat in a human bosom. Like the surgeon who severs a limb to save the patient, he exhibits the worst doom of sin to save the soul; and in this view, as Rabbi Duncan said, 'Hell is no blot on God's universe.' Nor is it a blot in the preaching of the Gospel, so far at least as it simply proclaims the absolute certainty of retribution for persistent sin.

A notable example of Dante's power of allegorizing on this theme is given in the image of the old man he sees in a mountain of the *Inferno*. This he uses to set forth, as in Daniel's vision,³ the inborn weakness of our sinful race as alone responsible for all the suffering it has to endure. It is the sins and woes of men that form the dark streams of Hell.

Within the mountain stands a huge old man⁴
Who holds his shoulders turned towards the East,⁵
And looks at Rome as if it were his glass.
His head is shapen of fine gold: his arms
Of silver purified and so his breast.
Then far as to the fork he is of brass;
But downward further of choice iron framed,
Save that his right foot is of baken clay
On which he stands erect more than the left.
Each part, except the gold, a fissure shows
That droppeth tears which, gathering force,
Pierce through the cave. Thence down the vale
They flow from rock to rock until they form
Acheron, Styx and Phlegethon in turn.
At last their course is through this strait defile
Down to the point where more descent is stayed:
And there they make Cocytus.⁶

Equally clear also becomes the brighter side of human experience given in the *Purgatorio*. It is a rich and varied drama of the soul under the con-

¹ *Le Epistole*, ut sup. p. 518.

² Canto xi. ll. 94-96.

³ Dn 2²¹⁻³³.

⁴ Cf. Eph 4²², Col 3⁹.

⁵ Lit. Damietta on the Nile, i.e. in the direction of the first Paradise.

⁶ Canto xiv. 103-119.

viction of righteousness. For righteousness here is not mere inexorable justice. As the Lord Jesus indicates, it is rather the Divine motive power which led Him to the right hand of the Father on high, and now directs His present unseen ministry there, while He calls men to repentance and by His Spirit gives them strength to exercise it for the salvation of their souls. In the *Purgatorio* Dante depicts the method and operation of this believing penitence. Accordingly, he turns the pilgrims into an entirely different sphere. The scene of this part of the poem is no longer in the depths of the earth but a very lofty mountain in the antipodes of Jerusalem and apparently rising out of the Southern Pacific. Here again, as in the descent into the *Inferno*, there are stages in the journey; but now these are marks of ascent to the summit in the shape of terraces, symbolic of growth in the varied graces of the Christian character. For the denizens of this fair region have made a full surrender to the will of God; and in spite of the suffering for past sin which they have still to endure, they are full of aspiration and hope of reaching the blessed life of the highest communion with God.

As evangelical Protestants, we of course dissent from the representation which Dante, in accordance with the only doctrine he knew, gives of the suffering believing souls may have to undergo after death as a satisfaction for sins not adequately dealt with in the course of earthly life. For we believe in a present forgiveness of sins that is as real and full as it is gracious and everlasting. But this difference does not prevent our belief in spiritual progress in the heavenly world; and it certainly summons us, as Dante intends, to make our calling and election sure now by a growing holiness of heart and life. Happily, also, our Protestant creed only sets us free to insist the more earnestly that believing men and women are bound to make now on earth full satisfaction for every act of injustice or deception or fraud of which they may have been guilty before conversion. It was a constant element in the teaching of the American evangelist, D. L. Moody, that, if we shall not have to face any Purgatory hereafter, we have one we are bound to pass through now. In his creed, confession followed by restitution was a condition of real peace and progress as definite and inexorable as in that of George Macdonald. Without it the soul could not get

finally right with God or man. In this respect the *Purgatorio* may well be taken as reminding us that no atonement means simply no complete harmony with the righteous will of God as it operates in the life of men.

Where penitence assumes this form, the soul receives a wonderful impulse to advance in the path of sanctification and to exhibit every form of holy obedience that the glorified Lord expects. Prayer, for example, and especially in the form of intercession, becomes a delight as well as a duty: and in this connection the Lord's Prayer is found to be fraught with new meaning and force, not merely as a form of supplication or as a summary of prayer themes but as a matchless compendium of Divine truth. With a beautiful appropriateness Dante introduces a striking version of it which he heard sung at one point in his ascent of the sacred Mount.

Finally, and of necessity more briefly, I have to add that in the *Paradiso* the drama of the soul is presented as a conviction of judgment: not, however, in the sense of a judgment to come. It is the self-vindicating energy of God, seen in the condemnation and expulsion of Satan and, by implication, the final enthronement of the Prince of Life and Love and the introduction through Him of a new victorious reign of grace, the whole atmosphere of which is saturated with righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.

After Dante and his guide reach the top of the lofty Hill of Purgatory and enter into the Earthly Paradise there, Virgil, the type of the highest human wisdom, gives place to Beatrice, 'the Lady' of his earthly choice. It is she whom he so loved and honoured that is now to be his guardian and teacher. After her death she became to him the type of glorified womanhood. By the time he reaches the last stages of his poem, to his ardent soul she seems a veritable revelation of the wisdom of God, and, by her very eyes which look upon the Divine Face, a channel of its communication to his mind.

Paradise then becomes pictured to us as a succession of spheres, enfolding one another yet also rising one above another, in the order of the planets in the solar system. While virtually one, heaven is thus conceived as made up of ten heavens, each of which represents some distinct truth that has to be received or some special grace that has to be attained. First come the

infra-solar heavens, that is, the Moon, Mercury, and Venus. It is in one of these that Dante meets Piccarda Donati. When he asks whether she is enjoying real happiness where she abides, he receives an answer that has ever been very precious to many readers :

The power of love, my brother, holds our will
And makes us long only for what we have,
Without imparting any other thirst.
Did we desire to take a higher place,
Then would our longings only ill accord
With His most blessed Will Who placed us here.

In His Will is our peace : it is the Sea
To which all moves that it creates
Or nature itself hath made.¹

The four heavens that succeed are the Sun, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn, representing the four cardinal virtues of Wisdom, Fortitude, Justice, and Temperance. Then follow the two heavens of the Fixed Stars and the *Primum Mobile*, the former being honoured by the manifestation of the glorified Word made flesh, the latter by the revelation of the celestial mysteries. Beyond these is the Empyrean, where the ransomed are brought into the immediate presence of God and the fulness of the beatific vision of His face.

¹ Canto iii. 70-75; 83-85.

So the drama of the soul is completed by the victory of the Love which moves 'alike the Sun and all the other stars.' What poem has ever presented to the heart of man such an entrancing prospect or such a potent stimulus to seek now the things that are above where Christ is, seated on the right hand of God, and to be here changed into His image from glory unto glory? Surely the death of the poet who wrote it is worthy of all the commemoration that has been lavished upon it. As I lay this humble tribute at his feet, I recall the earlier part of the proverb I quoted at the beginning: 'Better is a good name than precious ointment'; or, as E. H. Plumptre, to bring out the play of the original words, suggests: 'Better is a good name than good nard.' Such is surely the everlasting heritage of the great Florentine whom Italy to-day reveres as the glory of her national literature. Dante's name itself is 'as ointment poured forth.' When Mary of Bethany broke her flask of costly nard and poured its contents on Jesus' head in the presence of the guests, the fragrance of it filled the whole chamber where they reclined. At this time we can say without exaggeration that the fragrance of Dante's name seems destined to make itself felt throughout the whole world.

Literature.

PREHISTORY.

PREHISTORY is the short and easily to be remembered title which Mr. M. C. Burkitt, M.A., F.G.S., has given to his Study of Early Cultures in Europe and the Mediterranean Basin (Cambridge: at the University Press; 35s. net). It is one of those scientific manuals for which the Cambridge Press has become famous—their very appearance being expressive of the best modern workmanship. The cost of publishing may be great, but there is no suggestion of that in these beautifully printed and abundantly illustrated volumes. This volume itself has no fewer than forty-seven full-page illustrations printed on specially prepared paper.

The object of the book is to instruct the student on all that has been discovered about men as they

were before the writing of history began. Something reliable has been learned about his body and brain, his home, his tools, his animals, his civilization, his art. Considering the difficulties of the study, it is a surprise that it has yielded so much. Mr. Burkitt's descriptions are clear, and when he is convinced he is very convincing.

One chapter brings up to date the discoveries of skulls and other bones of Prehistoric Man. And that is always and universally interesting. But the chapters of most account are those, seven in number, which describe the Art of Palæolithic Man. This has been Mr. Burkitt's special study. In the pursuit of it he has travelled over Europe. He has been 'able to take part in several important diggings and to study nearly all the painted caves, etc., on the spot.' Such travel, he says, is necessary. 'If a serious student really

wants to get into the atmosphere of these magic temples he must sooner or later make up his mind to visit at least one of the groups. Also, a short time at some of the diggings in Dordogne or in the Pyrenees will teach the student more than months of book-work. Here in England we are excellently situated for the elucidation of many of the geological problems—Man's relation to the Ice Age and the like—but, as far as we know, we have little or no Art in our caves, and indeed after Acheulean times the climate never was favourable for any flourishing cultures until Neolithic times. This does not mean that there is not plenty for us to do in England, but for the student, in process of learning his subject, there is no place like France or North Spain, as regards the Archæology of the Stone Ages in Western Europe.'

Where are these painted caves to be seen? 'There is one centre in Dordogne, with a concentration round Les Eyzies. Here are to be found such caves and grottoes as Gorge d'Enfer, Tayac, La Mouthe, Font-de-Gaume, Combarelles, Bernifal, La Calévie, La Grèze, Cap Blanc, and Comarque. As outliers to this district may be mentioned Teyjat, which lies north-west of Périgueux, near the little village of Javerlhac, not far from Nontron; and Pair-non-Pair, which lies close to the junction of the rivers Dordogne and Garonne near the little town of Bourg-sur-Gironde.

'The second centre is the Pyrenees. Starting from east to west, we find in the Ariège district the caves of Niaux, Bedeilhac, and Le Portel, the latter close to the station of Baulou on the railway line from Foix (Ariège) to St. Giron. Further westward, close to St. Giron itself, we have the famous Tuc d'Audoubert. Close to this is another cave, not yet described, called the Trois Frères, which contains a human figure, partly painted, partly engraved, which is represented as if wearing a mask of stag's horn on its head and a tail. There are also drawings of lions and owls. At the great cave of Mas d'Azil a few poor drawings of Palæolithic age are found. Further westward again, not far from the little town of Salies-du-Salat, is the cave of Marsoulas, at the entrance of which deposits containing Upper Aurignacian and Upper Magdalenian industries have been found. Another place further west where Palæolithic art occurs is the cave of Gargas before mentioned, which lies not far from Montréjeau, near the little hamlet of Aventignan. Still westwards at Isturitz there

are said to be bas-reliefs of Solutrean age. These may well be a cultural survival from Upper Aurignacian times.

'The third centre is in North Spain, north of the Cordillera Cantabrica, which is really a continuation of the Pyrenees. Here we find a large number of paintings and engravings in caves.

'Amongst others may be mentioned Venta de la Perra, with its engraving of a bear; Covalanas, with its frieze of hinds made in the punctuation or dotted style; Castillo, famous not only for the many and varied manifestations of art that occur, but also for the extraordinary number of deposits found at the entrance of the cave, there being twenty-five layers, twelve of them containing archæological remains. Close by is the cave of Pasiega, specially rich in early styles of painting. Not very far from Pasiega there is Hornos de la Peña, which contains hardly anything but engravings, and those mostly of Aurignacian age. Nearer Santander is El Pendo, with its two engravings of birds, and Santian, with its frieze of conventionalised human hands. Still further westward we come to Altamira itself, not only justly famous for its wonderful painted ceiling, but also for the deeper galleries which show us a rich and varied art. Going still westward we have a very primitive form of art in the cave of La Clotilde, and varied styles in the cave of Pindal.

'Another example further west must be cited, Bolao Llanes, not because it contains anything of any great beauty, for it has nothing to show us but a single frieze of tectiforms. These tectiforms, however, are on the arched roof overhanging a subterranean lake, and they may have been made by old Stone Age Man, as an indication of the spot where he could get cool water, or in connection with some water magic.

'Finally the two decorated caves of Buxu (Asturias) and of Candamo (Asturias) must be mentioned. The former contains figures of horse (common), bison (one), stag (common), fallow-deer (one), ibex (three) and signs. There are three series of different ages. The latter cave contains stags (ten), ox (fifteen), bison (five), ibex (four), wild boar (one), horses (eleven), chamois (two), Anthropomorphic figures (two) and signs.'

THE CORPUS GLOSSARY.

The Professor of Humanity in the University of St. Andrews, Dr. W. M. Lindsay, has rendered a

notable service to the study of English in editing the Glossary which is preserved in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and is known as *The Corpus Glossary* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 40s. net).

The editing of a Glossary is a work of quite extraordinary difficulty. Two things have to be done. First, each gloss has to be traced to its origin; and next, every word of each gloss has to be reproduced in the most accurate form attainable. It demands the exercise of unflinching perseverance and unflinching judgment. No man could do the work alone. Professor Lindsay freely acknowledges assistance. Miss H. M. Buckhurst's name is given on the title-page as the compiler of the Anglo-Saxon Index, which occupies four-and-twenty pages in double column at the end of the book. And in the Preface Dr. Lindsay particularly names Dr. Henry Bradley, joint-editor of the Great Oxford English Dictionary, 'who kindly undertook to look through all the bilingual items and correct any error in an Anglo-Saxon form. To his painstaking in the discharge of this labour of kindness the accuracy of the Anglo-Saxon side of our edition is due. But further, being attracted by this research in his own field of lexicography, he subjected the Latin words too to a careful scrutiny, keeping our MS. for many months and writing in it a very large number of very valuable suggestions. *Nihil fere quod tetigit non emendavit*. His services to the book would be more adequately expressed by the mention of him (as co-editor) on the title-page than by a mere acknowledgement in the preface. If our readers will ascribe to him nearly everything that is good (and new) in the following pages, they will not be quite wrong.'

The Glossary itself is followed by notes. In one of these notes Professor Lindsay shows how incessant, and how insistent, was the demand for the exercise of judgment. The entry in the Glossary is, Ab(n)egato: venenato. How is that equation to be explained? 'If there were no clue,' says the Editor, 'we might give our imagination free scope. We might guess, e.g. Abigeiato (Imperative or Participle of the late Latin verb *abigere*): venenato, "Remove(d): kill(ed) by poison." Or (since plant-names often shew barbarous spelling) Apiatum: *σελινάτον* (a Philoxenus gloss, II. 19, 33). Or (a conceivable Philoxenus gloss) *Ἀπ' ἀγαθού*: bene natus. Or Apic(ul)ato: venenato, "poisonous." And so on—ad infinitum.

If the Corpus Glossary could be edited only in this happy-go-lucky fashion, an edition would not be worth printing.'

What clue, then, is there? The source must be discovered. Some of the words before and behind are taken from Orosius' *Histories*. A careful examination shows that this word must be looked for in Orosius, between 4, 16, 9 and 5, 15, 16. Now 'there are two mentions of poison in ch. xx. of Book IV (4, 20, 28 Demetrium . . . legatum . . . veneno necavit; 4, 20, 29 Hannibal apud Prusiam . . . veneno se necavit). Was the source of our item a marginal index-heading at 4, 20, 28 LEGATO VENENATO, or the like? That is a barely possible explanation and might almost get a place in the apparatus criticus, if for nothing else, to indicate Oros. 4, 20, 28 (or 29) as a possible source. But it is far from convincing and could never claim a place in the text. Far more convincing is the appearance of the phrase *abnegato cibo* at 5, 14, 6 (*alli suspendio, alii abnegato cibo sese consumperunt*). In the English (?) MS. of Orosius *abnegato* has been miswritten *abegato*. The puzzled annotator conjectured the meaning to be "poisoned." (Or else, finding the true reading *abnegato*, he misunderstood it as "poisoned.")'

Besides Orosius' *Histories*, the original sources of the Latin words seem to have been Jerome's *De Viris Illustribus*, Rufinus' version of Eusebius' *Church History*, Phocas' *Grammar*, the Vulgate Bible, and Gildas' *De Excidio Britanniae*. But the greater number of its entries come from four great storehouses which were already in existence—the Abstrusa Glossary, the Abolita Glossary, Hermeneumata, and the Philoxenus Glossary.

The Anglo-Saxon words are often of intense interest. To take an early example—'Anguens: breer.' In his Notes Dr. Lindsay says: 'This expressive name ("worrying," "the worrier") for the briar or bramble (W.W. 35c, 16 Anguens: bremer) is wrongly doubted by the Thes. Ling. Lat. (s.v.).' The word reminds us of Jotham's Parable, in which the point is that the bramble was to be the tormentor.

CROCE ON HISTORY.

Mr. Douglas Ainslie, B.A., M.R.A.S., has translated into English a volume of papers by Benedetto Croce, which appeared in the Proceedings of Italian Academies and in Italian journals between

1912 and 1913. They form part of a general scheme and are appropriately brought together into a single volume. Indeed, the volume is spoken of as the fourth in that series entitled 'The Philosophy of the Spirit' to which belong the 'Logic,' the 'Philosophy of the Practical,' and the 'Æsthetic'—all of which have been translated by Mr. Ainslie. Croce himself says: 'The description of the volume as forming the fourth of my *Philosophy of the Spirit* requires some explanation; for it does not really form a new systematic part of the philosophy, and is rather to be looked upon as a deepening and amplification of the theory of historiography, already outlined in certain chapters of the second part, namely the *Logic*. But the problem of historical comprehension is that toward which pointed all my investigations as to the modes of the spirit, their distinction and unity, their truly concrete life, which is development and history, and as to historical thought, which is the self-consciousness of this life. In a certain sense, therefore, this resumption of the treatment of historiography on the completion of the wide circle, this drawing forth of it from the limits of the first treatment of the subject, was the most natural conclusion that could be given to the whole work. The character of "conclusion" both explains and justifies the literary form of this last volume, which is more compressed and less didactic than that of the previous volumes.' The title is *Theory and History of Historiography* (Harrap; 15s. net).

The volume is concerned with answering the question, What is History? Well, what is it?

First of all, it is not Chronicle. 'Chronicle and history are not distinguishable as two forms of history, mutually complementary, or as one subordinate to the other, but as two different spiritual attitudes. History is living chronicle, chronicle is dead history; history is contemporary history, chronicle is past history; history is principally an act of thought, chronicle an act of will.' 'The discovery of the real distinction between chronicle and history, which is a formal distinction (that is to say, a truly real distinction), not only frees us from the sterile and fatiguing search after material distinctions (that is to say, imaginary distinctions), but it also enables us to reject a very common presupposition—namely, that of the *priority* of chronicle in respect to history. *Primo annales* [chronicles] *fuere, post historiam facta sunt*, the saying of the old grammarian, Mario Vittorino, has

been repeated, generalized, and universalized. But precisely the opposite of this is the outcome of the inquiry into the character and therefore into the genesis of the two operations or attitudes: *first comes history, then chronicle*. First comes the living being, then the corpse; and to make history the child of chronicle is the same thing as to make the living be born from the corpse, which is the residue of life, as chronicle is the residue of history.'

Then there are pseudo-histories which are not history. First, 'the ingenuous belief cherished by the philologists that they have history locked up in their libraries, museums, and archives (something in the same manner as the genius of the *Arabian Nights*, who was shut up in a small vase in the form of compressed smoke) does not remain inactive, and gives rise to the idea of a history constructed with things, traditions, and documents (empty traditions and dead documents), and this affords an instance of what may be called *philological* history.' Next, there is that kind of history which may be called *poetical* history. Examples 'are afforded by the affectionate biographies of persons much beloved and venerated and by the satirical biographies of the detested; patriotic histories which vaunt the glory and lament the misadventures of the people to which the author belongs and with which he sympathizes, and those that shed a sinister light upon the enemy people, adversary of his own; universal history, illuminated with the ideals of liberalism or humanitarianism, that composed by a socialist, depicting the acts, as Marx said, of the "cavalier of the sorry countenance," in other words of the capitalist, that of the anti-Semite, who shows the Jew to be everywhere the source of human misfortune and of human turpitude and the persecution of the Jew to be the acme of human splendour and happiness.' Finally, there is *rhetorical* history. 'Its object was to teach philosophy by example, to incite to virtuous conduct, to impart instruction as to the best political and military institutions, or simply to delight, according to the various intentions of the rhetoricians. And even in our own day this type of history is demanded and supplied not only in the elementary schools (where it seems to be understood that the bitter of wisdom should be imbibed by youth mingled with the sweet of fable), but among grown men. It is closely linked up with politics, where it is a question of politics, or with

religion, philosophy, morality, and the like, where they are concerned, or with diversions, as in the case of anecdotes, of strange events, of scandalous and terrifying histories.'

What, then, is History? It is Philosophy. 'There is neither philosophy nor history, nor philosophy of history, but history which is philosophy and philosophy which is history and is intrinsic to history. For this reason, all the controversies—and foremost of all those concerned with *progress*—which philosophers, methodologists of history, and sociologists believe to belong to their especial providence, and flaunt at the beginning and the end of their treatises, are reduced for us to simple problems of philosophy, with historical motivation, all of them connected with the problems of which philosophy treats.'

The result is truly Crocean. What will Mr. Bertrand Russell say to it? For of Philosophy this is what he says: 'Philosophy has made greater claims and achieved fewer results than any other branch of learning.'

MATTHEW LEISHMAN.

Near the end of the Ten Years' Conflict in the Church of Scotland there was formed a party eager for conciliation and compromise, anxious to save the Church from disruption. They were known as the Middle Party, more familiarly as the Forty Thieves, though there were five and forty of them. The last name on the list was 'Norman Macleod,' who wrote: 'I will feel obliged by your adding, if possible, my name to the list of the "Forty Thieves" who are willing to take Sir George's Bill. I hope it is now a Rebellion of the *Forty-Five*. Many thanks for your wise policy at this critical juncture of affairs.' The leader of that party was the Rev. Matthew Leishman, D.D., Minister of the Parish of Govan, near Glasgow.

The parish of Govan is part of Glasgow now and has seen changes. 'To his sister Marion at Torquay, two years before his death, Matthew Leishman writes: "When you and I came to Govan in 1821, it did not contain over 1000 inhabitants; now (July, 1872) it contains over 26,000. There was then only one small chapel belonging to the 'Relief' body." To-day (1921) there are over thirty charges connected with the Church of Scotland alone, while the population of the civil parish of Govan exceeds that of the city of Edinburgh.

A Cabinet Minister on visiting Govan in 1882, doubted "whether America or Australia could furnish a parallel for rapid increase." To be parish minister in a parish which multiplied at that pace meant work enough for every hour of the day. Yet Dr. Matthew Leishman found time to write and edit books (he is the editor, for example, of Wodrow's *Analecta*) and to be, as we have said, a great ecclesiastical leader.

His biography has been written by James Fleming Leishman, M.A., the title, *Matthew Leishman of Govan and the Middle Party of 1843* (Paisley: Gardner; 10s. 6d. net). Why was it not written sooner? Dr. Leishman died in 1874. That it was worth the writing, the writing of it proves. His biographer is in keen sympathy with his grandfather (though in the conflict he would not have been of the Middle Party), and discovers to us a fine example of the faithful and true among the ministers of Scotland. Here and there a point might be discussed, but only one is serious enough for mention. Touching on 'the Men'—'that singular guild of lay preachers' in the Highlands, Mr. Leishman refers for information about them to the late Dr. K. M. Phin's book. That book is too unsympathetic. A reference to the judicial and most informing article by Mr. G. R. Macphail in the *ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS* would have been better.

There is no craving after wit and humour; Dr. Leishman was not a born humorist like Norman Macleod; but there are good new touches of Scottish character. 'Once when visiting at Hillhead, Leishman put the usual question to a collier's wife, in her husband's absence, whether he kept up family worship; the shamefaced answer was: "No; you see, Sir, he canna' sing ony, although there isna a better whistler in a' the raw."

'At the accession of Queen Victoria, early in July, 1837, Leishman, along with Dr. Chalmers and Sir George Ballingall, Professor of Military Surgery at Edinburgh, set sail from Leith, one of a deputation of twelve sent by the General Assembly to present an Address from the Church of Scotland. The deputation was headed by Dr. Matthew Gardiner of Bothwell, described by Leishman—his fast friend—as "rather a sleepy Moderator." "We met at the 'Thatched House' Tavern near St. James' and walked thence to the Palace, with the Mace at our head. We all

admired, when admitted into the Throne Room, our youthful Queen. Dr. Muir of St. Stephen's was enchanted with her 'beautiful intonations' in reading her reply. After the address we approached to kiss the Queen's hand. Retiring from the Royal Presence, the Moderator's remark made in my ear was amusing and characteristic. 'Only think, Leishman, that growing lassie to be the Sovereign of these realms. Why! she is just like a modest manse bairn.' This in the broadest Scottish accent."

IN DAYS TO COME.

To the question, Who is the most popular author in Germany? the answer is, Walther Rathenau, the Minister of Reconstruction. He has published seventeen volumes, and the least successful of them has passed through nine editions. Of them all the most successful is *Von Kommenden Dingen*, which has reached its sixty-fifth edition some months ago. That book has been translated into English by Eden and Cedar Paul, and published by Messrs. Allen & Unwin under the title of *In Days to Come* (12s. 6d. net).

It is not so easy to read as you expect so popular a book to be. You must reckon with the difference between you and a German reader. There are also outspokennesses that must arrest the German eye, and perhaps delight the German heart—the very popular heart. For example, there is denunciation of the German ruling class. 'There are moments when the sentiment of community is powerful. As we contemplate our armies marching and dying, a unifying love wells up in our hearts, and we are fascinated by the dream of a perfect union. It remains a dream, for the two nations do not unite. We are ruled by the nobility, by a nobility arrogant in its wealth, slowly decaying but to a large extent renewed, adulterated by inter-marriage with industrial castes, so that while half its members bear historic names the other half are of bourgeois origin. This nobility monopolises the military and political powers of the state. A plutocratic order controls the great industries, exercising both secret and open influence; these plutocrats force their way into the fluctuating territorial nobility; they conserve their forces by admitting to their ranks able scions from the remnants of the middle class, and protect themselves against disintegration.'

Then there is much pleasant, sometimes profound, writing about the days to come—good to read by us all, very good by a defeated and disillusioned Germany. 'In days to come no one will be despised, for this sentiment is a crime against God's dignity. The people of those days will not despise backward persons, who are still slaves in body and in mind, will not torment them, but will lovingly endeavour to lift them upward. From earliest youth, anyone who is backward will be relieved of responsibility until sufficiently enlightened to bear responsibility; he will not be entrusted with responsibility until he has wrestled his way towards the truth. To the sallies and witticisms of the backward, to their indignant protests, to their cajoleries and attempts at persuasion, the more advanced will present an imperturbable front. Even in childhood, such poisons will be recognised and avoided, will be described by intelligible names. Occupations in which qualities of this order are requisite, modes of life, fashions in clothing, and methods of enjoyment, which display them, will no longer be considered honourable. The occupation of a sewerman will be more highly respected than that of a gossip or a pushing fellow; morbid aberrations will be less censured than luxury and display; sailors' brothels will not be so severely condemned as will be places where art is coarsely caricatured.'

THE FERNLEY LECTURE.

It is a sign of these hard times which we are trying to live through that a Fernley Lecture appears in a paper cover. And what is worse, it is one of the best of the Fernley Lectures (we possess the series complete to date), a volume which has to be read slowly, steadily, to the end, and then read over again.

The title is *Altar, Cross, and Community* (Epworth Press; 4s. net). The author is Mr. W. F. Lofthouse, M.A., Tutor in Old Testament Languages and Literature, and in Philosophy, in Handsworth College, Birmingham. We have heard Professor Lofthouse called the rising hope of scholarly Methodism: he has not disappointed those who expected him to rise. This is his best and greatest book.

And, first of all, it proves the necessity of such a work as the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*. Professor Lofthouse is a preacher and a

teacher of preachers, yet his range, his absolutely necessary range of study, is the range of the Encyclopædia. Beyond the Encyclopædia he does not go. He does not need to go. But there is not an article in it that is irrelevant to his pulpit and class work.

Professor Lofthouse's subject is Sacrifice. The word is a challenge. In no easier or more accurate way can you characterize Modernism than by saying that it will have nothing to do with sacrifice. They have passed, say the Modernists (we use the word in the extreme application of it), from all sacrificial ideas as surely as from all sacrificial practices. And besides being a challenge, it is a call. To the idea of sacrifice we have to be called as something that is fundamental—no husk that can be cracked and cast aside, but the very kernel of our religion itself—the very kernel of all religion indeed, but of the Christian religion the essential meaning and triumphing power. 'Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone'—the Modernist has no room for such a text; with the follower of Christ it fills all the room. Now this subject has not been handled in our time with more learning or ability than it is here handled by Professor Lofthouse. The treatment of it is modern enough—on that score have you no fear. But modernist it is not; and you will find it is not when you go through the book. But great as sacrifice is, it is not the end. The end is Reconciliation. If that word could be severed from sacrifice, Professor Lofthouse would claim it as greater and his own. It cannot be separated. One thing only has to be observed, that sacrifice as the end, sacrifice for its own sake, though it cost everything, is worth nothing.

Return to the range of study. And let us quote: 'Such an inquiry demands more than theology by itself can give. It must call in the aid, not only of ethnology, but of psychology. Both theologians and ethnologists have suffered from the absence of psychological imagination. We cannot blame theology if, criticising the various theories to which she has given birth, she maintains the studious aloofness of an abstract science. But she must recognize that, in so doing, she cannot satisfy souls which know the yearnings, the hopes and the despairs of the search for God, or heal a society heaving in the throes of volcanic convulsions. And all workers in the field of ethnology, whether as observers or collators, deserve our gratitude for noting the externals of the

rites of forest or bush or prairie, as a musician might jot down the notes of a negro slave-song, without a hint of the hope or terror or bewilderment of the savage in the moonlit clearing or the slave in the mud swamp. But the first requisite in dealing with men, whether to influence them or only to understand, is to know their needs and aims and instincts, and to sympathize with every passing but often tyrannous mood. If philosophy begins with wonder, sympathy is the source of any useful and fruitful psychology, and hence of any real knowledge of the profound laws which are manifested in human action. If, then, reconciliation lies at the centre of the Church's preaching—at the heart of the "good news" with which the Church has been entrusted—it will be necessary to understand both the laws according to which that reconciliation acts, and the need which it has to fulfil. Should the study in the following pages assist this understanding, it will be enough.'

CROCE AS A CRITIC.

We are only at the beginning of the study of Shakespeare. The text is under process of transformation—see the new edition which the Cambridge Press has begun to issue. The meaning is under process of revolution—see the critical essay on 'William Shakespeare' in *Ariosto, Shakespeare, and Corneille*, by Benedetto Croce, translated by Douglas Ainslie, and published at the Ruskin House of Messrs. Allen & Unwin (10s. 6d. net).

'The first observation leaps to the eye and is generally admitted: namely, that no particular feeling or order of feelings prevails in him; it cannot be said of him that he is an amorous poet, like Petrarch, a desperately sad poet like Leopardi, or heroic, as Homer.'

'Nor is he a poet of *ideals*, as they are called, whether they be religious, ethical, political, or social. This explains the antipathy frequently manifested towards him by apostles of various sorts, of whom the last was Tolstoi, and the unsatisfied desires that take fire in the minds of the right thinking, urging them always to ask of any very great man for something more, for a supplement. They conclude their admiration with a sigh that there should really be something missing in him—he is not to be numbered along those who strive for more liberal political forms and for a more equable social balance, nor has he had

bowels of compassion for the humble and the plebeian. A certain school of German critics (Ulrici, Gervinus, Kreyssig, Vischer, etc.), perhaps as an act of opposition to such apparent accusations (I would not recommend the reading of these authors, whom I have felt obliged to peruse owing to the nature of my task) began to represent Shakespeare as a lofty master of morality, a casuist most acute and reliable, who never fails to solve an ethical problem in the correct way, a prudent and austere counsellor in politics, and above all, an infallible judge of actions, a distributor of rewards and punishments, graduated according to merit and demerit, paying special attention that not even the slightest fault should go unpunished. Now setting aside the fact that the ends attributed to him were not in accordance with his character as a poet and bore evidence only to the lack of taste of those critics; setting aside that the design of distributing rewards and punishments according to a moral scale, which they imagine to exist and praise in him, was altogether impossible of accomplishment by any man or even by any God, since rewards and punishments are thoughts altogether foreign to the moral consciousness and of a purely practical and judicial nature; setting aside these facts, which are generally considered unworthy of discussion and jeered at in the most recent criticism, as the ridiculous survivals of a bygone age, even if we make the attempt to translate these statements into a less illogical form, and assume that there really existed in Shakespeare an inclination for problems of that sort, they shew themselves to be at variance with simple reality. Shakespeare caressed no ideals of any sort and least of all political ideals; and although he magnificently represents political struggles also, he always went beyond their specific character and object, attaining through them to the only thing that really attracted him; life.'

So it is as an observer of life that Shakespeare is regarded by Croce, and only as an observer of life. What the man himself thought, felt, believed, or was, we simply do not know. He observed life and made it into poetry. 'He may have been impious and profane in active practical life as a Greene or a Marlowe, or a devout papist, worshipping with secret superstition, like an adept of Mary Stuart, and nevertheless he may have composed poetry with different presuppositions, upon thoughts that had entered his mind and had there

become formed and dominated in his spirit, without for that reason having changed the faith previously selected and observed.'

THE TALMUD.

'The laws of the Pentateuch do not embrace all the affairs of life, nor are they complete in themselves. They usually lay down general principles, and make no mention of the details which would be required in actual practice. For instance, Exod. xx. 10 declares: "The seventh day is a Sabbath unto the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any manner of work"; but there is no attempt to define what is to be understood by "work." From Jeremiah xvii. 21 f. it is seen that the carrying of a burden was regarded a breach of the Sabbath, though there is no mention of this in the Mosaic code. Moreover, the penalty for the desecration of the day of rest was omitted from the enactment; and when a case occurred, a difficulty arose "because it had not been declared what should be done to him" (Num. xv. 34). It cannot be doubted that complicated questions must soon have presented themselves for consideration as to what kind of work constituted a breach of the Sabbath, and the decisions became part of the traditional teaching. This is one of many examples which might be cited to show the necessity for an Oral Law to make the Written Law workable.'

The Oral Law came into existence gradually. By and by it was 'found necessary for the purpose of study to have the mass of traditional lore reduced to a systematic arrangement. The first attempt to do this was made by Hillel, who formulated six main divisions. His work was continued by R. 'Aqiba and R. Meir; but their classification did not meet with general approval. It was R. Judah the Prince who, about the end of the second century, finally succeeded in preparing a code which commanded universal acceptance by the Rabbis. His codification is known as the *Mishnāh*. It consists of six Orders, subdivided into sixty-three Tractates.'

The *Mishnāh* became the subject of critical study in the Schools of Palestine and Babylon. The discussions of these schools were called *Gēmārā*. The Talmud is the name given to the combined *Mishnāh* and *Gēmārā*.

'The proceedings of the Palestinian Schools

were probably first collected by R. Johanan, the famous *Amōrā* of the third century; but the Palestinian (usually, but less correctly, called Jerusalem) Talmūd as we now possess it belongs to the end of the fourth, or the beginning of the fifth, century. Who was its later Redactor is not known. The main work of compiling the proceedings of the Babylonian Schools was undertaken by Rab Ashē, the Principal of the renowned Academy in Sura, who is said to have spent thirty years on the task. He died in 427, leaving the work unfinished. It was resumed by Rabina II., who presided over the same Seminary from 488 to 499, and apart from some later additions, he left the Babylonian Talmūd substantially as we now have it. Neither Talmūd is a complete work, in the sense that it covers the whole of the *Mishnāh*. The Palestinian extends over thirty-nine Tractates, and of these some are defective, while the Babylonian extends only over thirty-seven; but the *Gēmārā* of the latter is both longer and of greater importance than that of its Palestinian rival.

The Rev. A. Cohen, M.A., sometime Scholar of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, has translated into English for the first time *The Babylonian Talmūd: Tractate B'rākōt*, with Introduction, Commentary, Glossary, and Indices (Cambridge: at the University Press; 3rs. 6d. net).

'*B'rākōt*, that is "Benedictions," is the first Tractate of the first Order. It is thus the opening Tractate of the Talmūd. Maimonides, in his Commentary on the *Mishnāh*, attempts an explanation of the sequence of the Orders and Tractates, and gives the following reason why the Talmūd opens with this Tractate: "[The Redactor of the *Mishnāh*] commences with the Order *Z'rā'im* ['Seeds'], because it contains the precepts that apply to the cultivation of the land, upon which depends the living of all creatures. . . . The reason which induced him to open with the Tractate *B'rākōt* is this: The expert physician who wishes to preserve a healthy person in good health first arranges his diet. Therefore the Sage [R. Judah the Prince] thought it proper to begin with the subject of 'Benedictions' because nobody is allowed to eat without first pronouncing a benediction. . . . On that account he deals with the various benedictions which a person is obliged to say with different articles of food and the commandments relating thereto."

Can any idea be given of the contents of the Tractate? At random this:

'Rab Judah said in the name of Rab: Four classes of people must offer thanksgiving: They who go down to the sea, who journey in the desert, the invalid who recovers and the prisoner who has been set free. "They who go down to the sea"—whence have we this? For it is written, "They that go down to the sea in ships . . . these saw the works of the Lord . . . He raised the stormy wind . . . They mounted up to the heaven, they went down to the deeps . . . They reeled to and fro, and staggered like a drunken man . . . They cried unto the Lord in their trouble, and He brought them out of their distresses. He made the storm a calm . . . Then were they glad because they were quiet . . . Let them give thanks unto the Lord for His mercy, and for His wonderful works to the children of men" (Ps. cvii. 23-31). "They who journey in the desert"—whence have we this? For it is written, "They wandered in the wilderness in a desert way; they found no city of habitation . . . Then they cried unto the Lord . . . and He led them by a straight way . . . Let them give thanks unto the Lord for His mercy" (*ibid.* vv. 4-8). "The invalid who recovers"—whence have we this? For it is written, "Crazed because of the way of their transgression, and afflicted because of their iniquities, their soul abhorred all manner of food . . . They cried unto the Lord in their trouble . . . He sent His word and healed them . . . Let them give thanks unto the Lord of His mercy" (Ps. cvii. 17-21). "The prisoner who has been set free"—whence have we this? For it is written, "Such as sat in darkness and in the shadow of death . . . because they rebelled against the words of God . . . Therefore He humbled their heart with travail . . . They cried unto the Lord in their trouble . . . He brought them out of darkness and the shadow of death . . . Let them give thanks unto the Lord for His mercy" (*ibid.* vv. 10-15).'

The Rev. Charles Hart, B.A., has written *A Shorter Bible History* for the use of Catholic Students (Burns, Oates & Washbourne; 3s. 6d. net). It does not appear to be an abbreviation of his Manual in two volumes, but to be written independently. He hopes to see it adopted as a

text-book in Schools and Colleges and read by laymen.

Master Gerlac Petersen, of Deventer, was a friend of Thomas à Kempis, and so akin was he in spirit to the reputed author of *De Imitatione Christi* that in old times he was known as 'Alter Thomas de Kempis.' His chief work is *The Fiery Soliloquy of God*. And of this work a new edition in English has been published by Messrs. Burns, Oates & Washbourne (3s. 6d. net). 'The present edition,' we are told, 'is little else than a transcription of an old English translation.' We shall quote a short chapter. It will give a fair idea of the value of the book.

'With love and affection our Lord Jesus Christ chose to become Man for our sakes, and to converse here amongst us in this wretched state of pilgrimage as the least and the poorest of all.

'He was in want, in sighs, and labours all the days of His Life; in persecutions, in most exceeding humble tolerance of evils and of proud adversaries; spending His whole Self for us both in body and soul; and even with such a love and not less, doth He offer Himself for us day by day without ceasing, and above all, upon the Altar.

'Yea, "even unto the end" He loves. "His own that are in the world" with a love like unto that incomprehensible love which He bore towards us when He offered Himself upon the Cross to the Eternal Father, a Living Victim, holy and without spot, in order that He might bring back upon His shoulders with joy the sheep which He had lost.

'And although the aforesaid proofs of love were shown forth once for all from without, yet every moment are they as newly given in the Father by the Son together with the Holy Ghost, as when they were shown forth from without.

'So also ought all the proofs of love which our Lord Jesus condescended to show forth in His own time for our salvation, to be daily received by us, as if now at this very instant they were being done for the first time.'

From the Cambridge University Press comes the second volume of the new Cambridge Shakespeare, edited by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and Mr. John Dover Wilson. It is *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (6s. net).

Let it be understood that this Shakespeare is a new departure. In the Shakespeare studies of the

future it will certainly be so recognized. Why? Partly because of Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch's introductions, but chiefly because of Mr. Dover Wilson's work on the text. In this play there is a good example of the courage of the editors in handling the difficulties of Shakespeare's text. Says Sir A. Quiller-Couch: 'The final scene of the *Two Gentlemen* is vitiated (as we hope to show) by a flaw too unnatural to be charged upon Shakespeare.' You turn to the scene: 'This scene is running a-gley, some interposing hand is murdering the verse along with dramatic consistency. Amid lines that have Shakespeare's trick and cadence are thrust strange ones that no ear can accept for his. Suddenly, with the crisis, we come upon the doggerel:

And that my love may appear plain and free,
All that was mine in Silvia I give thee.

Having noted the jingle which follows on the rhyme of "pleased" and "appeased," we note further that there is only one other instance in this melodiously written play of an unrhymed speech finished off with two rhymed couplets; and that is the very speech (uttered by Proteus) which, if it have any meaning at all, improves in caddishness upon Valentine's offence:

O heaven, were man
But constant, he were perfect; that one error
Fills him with faults . . .

—so far Shakespeare, perhaps: now for cacophony followed by nonsense:

makes him run through all th' sins;
Inconstancy falls off ere it begins:
What is in Silvia's face, but I may spy
More fresh in Julia's *with a constant eye*?

'Can anyone believe Shakespeare guilty of this pair of tags: the first lame in scansion and unmeaning, the second balanced for our choice between nonsense and rascality?' And further—but the whole clever criticism is in the book, it cannot be quoted here.

Is it not time to look for another Barrie—another and a better? Where are we to look for him? Where more likely than in Ireland? The strange thing is that he has been with us for some time. He has written about *My Lady of the Chimney Corner*, and the humour and the pathos

of it have swept its readers off their feet. Now he has written about *The Souls of Poor Folk* (Collins; 7s. 6d. net), and again the humour and the pathos are irresistible. The new Barrie is Alexander Irvine; and Antrim is his Thrums.

One of the surprises is the range of interest. No character is touched to finer issues than the Mother, yet the Father is not far away. The neighbours are thrown in inimitably. There were three of them in the Entry: McGrath, the rag man, O'Hare, the chimney-sweep, and Mary McConaghy. And the lad himself is there to see and hear and suffer and tell the whole human story to a world that will always wonder where he fell upon his glorious English-Irish style.

Mr. Gilbert T. Sadler, M.A., LL.B., has completed his exposition of the World Religion. The fourth and last volume is entitled *The Social Expression of the Spiritual Life* (Daniel; 3s. 6d. net). Mr. Sadler is as radical in his social as in his Biblical writings. In order to bring things round to what, in his thought, they ought to be, he advocates what he calls 'the Great Refusal,' which seems to be very like a general strike. 'Notice should be given to all freeholders, shareholders, and to the Government that after a certain date, no more rent will be paid, nor will men work in factories unless they share control and profits as a Group, nor will men serve as soldiers, nor pay taxes for the upkeep of the army and navy and War Office and Law Courts.'

The Epworth Press, under Mr. J. Alfred Sharp's management very much alive to the needs of the day, has begun the issue of a series of small books to be called 'Watchwords of Methodism.' One of the series is an exposition of *Salvation by Faith* by Dr. J. Agar Beet (3d.).

A new and revised edition has been published of *The Place of Methodism in the Catholic Church*, by Herbert B. Workman, D.Litt., D.D., Principal of the Westminster Training College and Senator of London University (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net).

A readable history of the English language has been written by James C. Fernald, L.H.D. The title is *Historic English* (Funk & Wagnalls). Emphasize 'readable.' The Publishers, in a

Foreword, tell us that 'more than ten years before his death, the author began this book. He did not hasten its publication; it was to be a more personal thing than any of the other twenty-five works that bear his name, and he wanted constantly to enrich and perfect it. He let "Historic English" benefit by all the ideas created in the most mature, yet active, years of his literary life.' But above all else, he resolved that his book should be read.

We turn to the story of the English Bible. 'The New Testament of Tyndale (1526) is the first live thing in the new literature after Chaucer's day,—the first that rises above the level of the commonplace. Spenser and Sidney were not yet born. More's "Utopia," written in Latin in 1516, was not put into English until 1551. The commonplace had, indeed, done valuable service. Through the various publications of Caxton's press; through translations from the French and Italian by men who had no originality; through the communication of trade, statesmanship and war; through the sermons of faithful divines, and through the widely circulated controversial tracts, often bitter, but always vigorous, had been evolved a new type of English speech, strong, vigorous, simple and above all things practical, ready for noble use whenever a genius should appear to test its power. William Tyndale was a linguistic genius.' That is the manner of it. Before the chapter ends we find the story of the Authorized Version with many quotations, showing how 'the flexible abundant English' of it can depict joy and trust (Ps 18), triumph (Ex 15), grief (2 S 1^{19.26}), and many other emotions.

Commentarius in Epistolam ad Ephesios, auctore Fr. Jacobo-Maria Vosté, O.P., Professore Exegeseos Novi Testamenti in Collegio Angelico de Urbe (Romae: Libreria del 'Collegio Angelico'; Parisiis: J. Gabalda).

This is the second volume on the Pauline epistles which Professor Vosté has published, although he is still a young man and is much occupied with class work. An attractive lecturer with a fine voice, he is also a lucid expositor. He has the command of a simple Latin vocabulary, which serves to express without effort his very accurate and extensive scholarship. We have not seen the commentary on the Thessalonians, but we have heard him lecture on the Romans,

and we have read with pleasure this excellent student's manual on the Epistle to the Ephesians.

One striking thing is his familiarity with English and English editors. He has the list of English commentators without an omission in his bibliography, and he shows throughout the commentary that he knows both how to use and how to criticise them.

The antiquarian bookseller is not for the moment on friendly terms with Mr. A. J. Balfour or Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton. For Mr. Balfour has made a few alterations on his book *A Defence of Philosophic Doubt*, and Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have issued it in a new edition at 12s. 6d. net. Now the bookseller was charging as much as three guineas for a good copy of the book, always announcing it as 'out of print and very scarce.' Matters are made worse for the bookseller in that the new edition is a handsomer book than the old.

Messrs. Lippincott are the publishers of *Princess Salome: A Tale of the Days of Camel-Bells*, by Burris Jenkins (7s. net). It has the Christ as its centre, and seeks to create an interest in Him by making us interested in the people who surrounded Him.

Messrs. Longmans have issued a cheap edition of Abbé Constant Fouard's *The Christ, the Son of God* (2s. 6d. net). It is a popular picturesque Life of Christ.

Keswick is more than 'Keswick teaching.' With the Rev. J. Stuart Holden it is the fulness of Christ. Mr. Holden has published twelve addresses delivered at the Keswick Convention with the title of *Your Reasonable Service* (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d. net). It is a descriptive title. The whole series says to us: 'This is the Way, walk ye in it.' Without the opportunity or the purpose of a system of Christian living, the addresses cover most of the Christian life, and always with fidelity to the mind of Christ. But better than much commendation will be an abbreviated address. Look for it 'In the Study.'

The Betrayal of Labour is the title which the author of *The Mirrors of Downing Street* has given to an open letter to the Right Hon. J. R.

Clynes, M.P. (Mills & Boon; 1s. net). 'Forgive me,' he says, 'if I say that your moral responsibility seems to me enormous. I do not think there is any man in the land, not even the Prime Minister, who now carries a greater burden of responsibility. I think the future of this country is largely in your hands, and that what you sow to-day England is like to reap to-morrow.'

Is this extravagant? he asks; and then goes on to tell Mr. Clynes and us why he looks upon it as the sober truth.

Bishop Charles Gore is the steward, instructed of God, who brings out of his treasury things new and old. In the volume of sermons preached in Grosvenor Chapel as a Lenten Course in 1921, and published by Messrs. Mowbray with the title of *Christian Moral Principles* (4s. net), there is just the right combination of the two. But for once the outlook into the future is more to him than the remembrance of the past. He is much concerned, as he well may be, about the neglect of the commandments of God—even the Ten Commandments themselves, which he finds still appropriate and imperative. But it is not their outward observance that would satisfy him. There are principles of moral conduct—take care of them and the moral acts will take care of themselves. Right necessary is the strong sermon on the use of money, and right impressive.

When we find a Doctor of Medicine in charge of a Sunday school we rejoice. When we find him making a success of it we rejoice greatly. When we find him making it an instrument for the progress of the Kingdom, the entrance on a habit of Worship, the incentive to a self-denying life for Christ, we rejoice with joy unspeakable. Mr. Charles W. Budden, M.D., of whom all this is true, has published *Worship in the Sunday School* (National Sunday School Union; 9d. net), in which he gives us all the information about his method that can be given, and a full account of the musical part of his service, with words and music. The musical part is the most important part. It includes Prayer along with Praise. *Orders of Worship for the Intermediate Department* are issued on separate slips (2s. 9d. net for 50; 5s. for 100).

Father Time Stories, by J. G. Stevenson, B.A.,

illustrated by Charles Robinson (R.T.S. ; 5s. net). Father Time is much concerned with the behaviour of little boys and girls. Now behaviour is not to be picked up all at once, it has to be learned slowly, painfully even. And so Father Time tells stories, each story having some part of a good boy or girl's behaviour hidden cunningly within it. Sometimes it is politeness, sometimes generosity, sometimes good temper—but whatever it is the story makes it worth practising. And whatever the stories do for good conduct, the illustrations are sure to do something in the way of pleasure, for the pen and ink sketches are full of character and the coloured pictures of beauty.

William Miller, M.A., LL.D., has written the story of *The Turkish Restoration in Greece, 1718-1797*, for the S.P.C.K. series of 'Helps for Students of History' (1s. 3d. net).

A little book, full of instruction on the subject of divorce, has been written by Canon G. H. Box and Bishop Charles Gore. Its title is *Divorce in the New Testament* (S.P.C.K. ; 2s. net), but it covers more ground than the New Testament, the Jewish practice being fully explained by Canon Box. The immediate object of the book is to reply to Archdeacon Charles.

The 'Jewish Studies,' edited by Dr. Lukyn Williams and published by the S.P.C.K., are to contain a history of the Jews since the Fall of Jerusalem. That is good news. Two volumes have been published—*The Jews of Eastern Europe*, by the Rev. J. H. Adeney, M.A. (3s. 6d. net); and *A Short History of the Jews in England*, by the Rev. H. P. Stokes, LL.D., Litt.D., F.S.A. (5s. 6d. net).

Mr. Adeney writes more popularly than his colleague, and will probably serve a larger audience. He gives some useful and some astonishing facts and figures. He tells us that before the War there were just over ten million Jews in the world. The War must have reduced that number considerably. In Bulgaria the number fell from sixty-seven thousand to thirty thousand. In the British Isles in 1918 there were two hundred and seventy-five thousand seven hundred. One astonishing fact recorded is this: 'Since the Bolshevik upheaval in 1919 in Budapest, it is said that no less than

30,000 Jews have been baptised into the Christian faith.' Mr. Adeney suggests that 'political motives are responsible for some part of this, but still the large number of baptisms in the Protestant churches goes to prove that very many are really in earnest, as membership of those churches does not confer the same social and political advantages as that of the predominant State church.'

Dr. Stokes writes more deliberately for the scholar and discusses some thorny questions, such as the question whether the expulsion of the Jews from England by Edward 1. was complete and remained complete till their return under Cromwell. He argues for its completeness and looks as if he had proved his case. Then Shakespeare never saw a Jew! Says Dr. Stokes: 'Marlowe's Barabbas and Shakespeare's Shylock were probably drawn from hearsay.' The book contains some illustrations, among the rest a reproduction from Skelton of the Domus Conversorum at Oxford. An interesting chapter is written on the Domus Conversorum, dealing especially with the D.C. in London, of which the Master of the Rolls had nominally the custody as late as 1873. When in that year Sir George Jessel became Master of the Rolls the other title was dropped, else 'we should have had the remarkable paradox of a Jew holding the position of Keeper of the House of Converted Jews.'

Mr. Joseph S. Johnston, finding publishers' charges in the United States prohibitive, has published his book *Christ Victorious Over All* himself. It may be obtained in Great Britain from Mr. E. A. Sutton, 131 Brookbank Road, London, S.E. 13 (8s. 6d. net).

What is the book? It is a strong plea for the victory of Christ over every form of evil in the world, including man's sin. We used to call the author's belief 'Conditional immortality.' But the old wine does not always do well in the new bottles. Mr. Johnston is convinced that there is no immortality except in Christ, but he is less concerned about that negation than about the positive results of Christ's incarnation, atonement, and resurrection. That all things whatsoever shall be subjected to Him, in order that He may cast them all at the Father's feet—that is his concern, that is his faith and his rejoicing.

The Redeemed Life.

BY THE REVEREND A. T. S. JAMES, B.A., M.Sc., EAST GRINSTEAD.

WHEN Paul said to the Roman Christians, 'Yield yourselves to God, as alive from the dead,' it was because they were suggesting that they gave God's grace a greater scope if they continued to sin. Divine love, they argued, found its glorious expression in forgiveness. The exercise of forgiveness was the most beautiful thing in the world. What if they did sin: it created the opportunity for God's pardoning mercy.

Paul was horrified, and well he might be. 'God forbid,' he cried. And so of course do we. The suggestion is absurd. But why is it absurd? And are we sure that we do not sometimes make the same mistake? Dangers of precisely this kind are in wait for us. What if it should be one of the besetting dangers of being 'evangelical'? It is worth while asking a little more closely what the Apostle meant and where his argument applies to our modern conditions.

Redemption is much more than the possession of forgiveness. One of the most searching parts of our redemption is God's dismissal of the past and of all that is against us. The pardon of God is full and without price; and the first joy of forgiveness is like the sense of freedom on some summer morning among the hills. It is a great gospel even if we get no further than the fact of forgiveness. But redemption is not merely a constant repetition of forgiveness.

Sometimes we forget this. For instance, there are many who think the Gospel goes no further than a mission service. They understand by it an extraordinary effort to convict men of sin and to speak of forgiveness through Christ. In accordance with that crude idea ministers are still expected to be edifying in the morning and evangelical at night.

And there are others who want to see all day long the colours of the morning's sunrise. They would like to have every day the astonishment which comes with the first perception of forgiving love. They wish to be all the time with Paul blinded by the glory of love on the road to Damascus. They would like to stand all the time before the cross like Christian when the heavy weight fell from his back. Practically their idea

of the Gospel and of redemption seems to end there, and to make the greatness of sin as it were an opportunity for the greatness of grace. The same feeling lies behind some of the extremer forms of asceticism. Against any and all of these distortions of truth, Paul's words sound a healthy protest. Redemption is not a kind of hydropathic treatment of the soul. It contains and emphasizes a positive active principle of life. It is the true natural life of the human spirit made one with the Divine Father in a surrender which is like a birth from the dead.

And this surrender to God day by day is always an integral part of redemption. Very often this is called consecration, and is kept in our minds in a place of its own. But consecration is really a part of redemption. Self-surrender is only a phrase. What do we surrender to? The worldly man surrenders to mammon; the lascivious man to lust; the miserly man to gold. But the redeemed man surrenders to God. What goes on to complete his redemption is that the Divine Spirit enters within him, and so it becomes true of him, 'For me to live is Christ.' But the redeemed man is constantly presenting himself to God. He has taken a new principle for his life, the principle of the Will of God. The salient thing about him is not that he lives daily in the ecstasy of forgiveness, but that Christ lives in him daily, and his life is no longer his own, but God's. And that is why the urgent thing for us is to give the new power, God's power, a chance with us by our daily surrender to it.

This is the central point of consecration, and it is a daily and vital part of the gospel of redemption. But consecration is treated as something additional, as a thing for conventions and special consecration services. There ought to be nothing special or extraordinary in the matter. Every hour is a consecration hour because it is in the plan of a redeemed life, and is in fact not our own life at all, but Christ's life in us. We go to the market, or sit at the office desk, or teach in the school, or do some homely task: and temptation comes near and evil looks within the heart. But the redeemed life brings the control of God's Spirit to these

things by yielding itself all the while to God. And when selfishness prompts us to ease and sin threatens our overthrow, then by yielding to God we win the victory. In no other way do we gain salvation and secure our redemption.

For redemption means at last a redeemed life, or else our saving is incomplete. Life is the thing; and life reached by surrender. It is all nonsense, said Paul, talking of doing evil that God in His grace may forgive. Redemption is not doing evil and claiming forgiveness for it, but living out the Divine will day by day. It is rejoicing in the spirit of right-doing just as a strong man delights in the excitement of work. *Living it out.* That is the real issue. The principle of redemption is thus a principle of life, a living of God's life by the power of God's Spirit. We have seen it lived out once. Christ did it. And if we have died to sin having received the Spirit of Christ, we must then rise with Christ and live Christ's redeemed life in ourselves. This is the sharp point of contact

between the Gospel and the world. It is where the trouble begins, and the break comes, and hatred sets in towards the Church, and the deep down repulsion in the heart of man to the righteousness of God gets in its 'Long Melford' blows. This is where the strain starts; not at the Cross, nor in the House Beautiful, but out on the highway where Apollyon and Giant Despair and Ignorance and Talkative ply their ancient trades. And it's a question how we bear the touch. If Jesus stood now in our highways as He stood once beneath the blue Syrian skies in the busy streets of the Judæan cities, and if He called us from our own special pursuits and ideals, called us to walk with Him in the path of service, I wonder, should we too speak of our business and our importunate household cares, and would His face be sorrowful as we too turned to our own doors? And would He weep again because we, like the children of Jerusalem, knew not the time of our visitation? That is the real test of our redemption.

In the Study.

Virginitus Puerisque.

Roller Bandages.

'A roller to bind it.'—Ezk 30²¹.

WHAT a lot of funny texts there are in the Bible! Have you ever looked for them? Do you know where the 'white of an egg' is mentioned? And can you tell me the verse which speaks of 'tossing a ball'? Or can you give me the chapter where we read of 'a wheel in the middle of a wheel'? Well, to-day's text is one of these odd texts that pull you up with a jerk and make you exclaim, 'Why, I never knew *that* was in the Bible!' You didn't expect to find a roller bandage or a broken arm in the Book of Ezekiel—did you? But here they are. And though the word 'bandage' is not there, the word 'roller' is, and 'a roller to bind it' is just a roller bandage.

Now, I expect most of you could tell me more about how to apply a roller bandage than I could tell you. You boy scouts and you girl guides, and

those of you who have learned anything about First Aid, know all about a roller bandage and its little ways—for it has little ways of its own which take a lot of knowing. But you know how the long straight strip of material has to be rolled tightly and evenly before you can start putting it on. You know how to wind it criss-crosswise round a wounded leg or arm, and you know how to roll it up as you take it off, otherwise you and your patient will be beautifully tangled together in yards of white bandaging. It takes a lot of practice and patience to put on such a bandage properly, but it's worth the time and trouble, for there is nothing more useful than a roller bandage in the right place.

Yes, but there's nothing more harmful than a roller bandage in the wrong place, and that is where some people persist in putting it. The correct place, as you know, is round a limb to support it or keep the dressings and splints in position. But there are thousands and thousands of people, both big and little, who go about the world wearing

roller bandages in the wrong place, and wearing them all day and every day too. Have you ever met any of them? I have. There are some of them sitting here in church this morning. 'Well,' you say, 'I don't see them.' Ah! wait a bit. It takes a special kind of sight to see them. I'll describe some of them to you and then you'll tell me if you recognize them. And, let me whisper it, I shouldn't wonder though you found yourself among them.

1. First, there are the people who wear a roller bandage over their eyes. These people walk down the road and they come home and can't tell you anything they have seen. If you ask them they will admit they have met a lot of motors, but they can't tell you whether they were delivery vans, or landaulettes, or two-seaters, or what were their colours, or whether they bore home numbers or numbers of another county. 'I never noticed,' is the excuse. If you ask such people to tell you how many claws a cat has, or how many legs a spider owns, they will reply, 'I'm sure I *should* know, but I really can't tell.' They've seen these things again and again but they've 'never noticed.'

Did you ever hear of the famous conjuror Robert Houdin? He was so quick with his hands that he could do tricks that seemed absolutely magical. But he found that to do these tricks he had to train his eyes to be as ready as his hands. So he used to take his son with him for a walk down the street and after they had passed a shop window, glancing in as they passed but not stopping, they used to count who had noticed the greatest number of things in the window.

It is a grand game 'noticing.' You boys learn it in your scoutcraft and so do you girl guides; and you can't learn it too well. It is tearing stupid bandages off your eyes.

But there is another way of wearing eye bandages, a dodgy way that is worse than the first. It is not a case of wearing them all day and every day, but a case of wearing them when it is convenient not to notice. Some boys and girls are experts at this. I've seen them at it. So have you. I've seen them come in from school to find mother (who has been slaving all forenoon in the house) struggling to set the dinner and to dish it up at the same time; and I've seen these boys and girls sit down with a book, or pop out to the garden to 'wait till dinner's ready.' They saw mother's difficulties but clapped on their eye bandages at

once. It was none of their business to set the dinner. It should be waiting on the table when they arrived to eat it. I'm glad to think these eye bandages are not in every home—aren't you?

2. Then lots of people wear bandages on their mind. This bandage-wearing usually begins when they are very young. The boys and girls who can't be bothered with lessons and are content so long as they can just scrape through their exams are wearing that bandage. They are keeping their brains from developing at the age when they should be developing most quickly. You have heard how the baby girls of China in the bad old days all had their feet bandaged tightly, so that when they grew up they still had the tiny useless feet of babies and could scarcely walk and certainly not run. Well, the boys and girls who are bandaging their minds will find that when they grow up their minds will be poor crippled things. And then if they want to learn they will find they can't. So don't grudge the effort to learn lessons. Seize on all the information and ideas you can, and make them yours. You will be tearing off the mind bandages and letting your brains grow.

3. But the most dangerous bandage to wear is the bandage round the heart. It is a bandage I hope none of you little people will ever wear. For the people who wear it are the most to be pitied on earth. Who are they? They are the people who think only of themselves. Somebody may be starving in the next street; but if *they* have a good dinner, why worry about that? Somebody next door may be sick or unhappy or ill-used; but if *they* are having a good time, what about it? Nothing counts and nothing matters so long as it doesn't touch them. They remind me of a little boy who was asked, 'What happened ten years ago?' 'Nothing happened,' said he, 'I was born only seven years ago.'

Boys and girls, bandaged hearts—hearts that are shrivelled and shrunken till there is no love left in them, no sympathy, no pity—are one of the saddest sights on earth. So if you see signs of the bandages of selfishness winding round your heart, tear them off quicker than you ever did anything in your life. Tear them off and throw them from you, and ask God to help you to grow up the happiest somebody in the world, a somebody who never thinks of self because he is so busy loving and serving his fellow-men.

Right-handed Hearts.

'A wise man's heart is at his right hand; but a fool's heart at his left.'—Ec 10².

That seems an upside-down sort of thing to say, doesn't it? At first sight you fancy that the old gentleman who wrote this verse must have been allowing his wits to go a wool-gathering. Those of you who are old enough to know your right hand from your left know that your heart is very decidedly on your left side. When you run up a hill you can feel it go pit-a-pat; when you get a sudden fright or a sudden pleasant surprise it gives a sort of jump, and you know just exactly where it is.

But the writer of these words was not so far wrong as we might imagine. You see he was speaking in a sort of picture, or, as we sometimes say, a figure of speech. He was thinking of the heart as the place where the understanding and the affections dwell, as a bit of us that rules our conduct and our actions, and so he said, 'A wise man's heart is at his right hand; but a fool's heart at his left.' The left hand was looked upon as the sign of weakness and indecision and foolishness. By some ancient nations, too, the left side was regarded as unlucky. But the right was the place of honour and the right hand was the sign of strength and firmness and wisdom.

The man whose heart is on his right hand loves and strives after the things that are kind and noble and good. 'His heart is in the right place,' as we say. Do you know that fine old story about brave Sir Walter Raleigh? When he came to be executed the executioner asked him which way he would lay his head, and Sir Walter answered, 'So the heart be right, it matters not which way the head lies.'

Now our great wish for all boys and girls, and for all men and women, too, is that their hearts be right, that they be in the right place. For if your heart be right, you are *all* right, but if your heart be wrong, you are *all* wrong.

And first, if we wish our hearts to be in the right place we must learn to *love* the things that are true and noble and beautiful. That isn't difficult, for the things that are lovely, both in nature and in the lives and works of men and women, are all round us, and we have only to look for them to find them. And if we keep on looking at these things, we shall grow to love them, for God put

into the heart of every one of us the power to know and to love the highest and the best.

2. But if we want our hearts to be in the right place, we must also strive to *do* the things that are brave and straight and kind. It isn't much good admiring beautiful things and brave deeds unless we try to get some of the beauty and the courage into our own lives. We may thrill when we hear of some glorious piece of heroism, and yet the next hour we may tell a lie to save ourselves from punishment. We may admire tremendously some splendid bit of self-sacrifice, but we may refuse to give up our fun for a few minutes to help a little brother in a difficulty or run an errand for mother. It's easy to admire the brave things and the beautiful things and the kind things, but it isn't so easy to do them.

3. So lastly, and most important of all, if we want to have our hearts in the right place we must give them into Jesus' keeping. He alone can keep them pure and true and brave, and He will never fail us if we trust them to Him.

I read a sort of fairy-tale the other day about a boy called Rupert who had a removable heart. It was the fashion in those days to have removable hearts, and it was quite a convenient fashion in some ways, for if you went into battle, all you had to do was to take out your heart and leave it behind you. Then if an enemy ran his sword through your body he couldn't kill you, for your heart wasn't there to kill.

The only trouble was to find a safe place to leave your heart, for the country was full of witches and sorcerers, and it wasn't safe to keep it even in the usual place—inside your body.

Some of Rupert's friends had been very unfortunate in their choice of a hiding-place. One of them had given his heart to a beautiful lady who told him she would lay it away safely in her jewel-box. Instead of that she scratched it and squeezed it, and then when it was of no more use she flung it back to him.

Another friend had locked his heart up in his safe beside his money. But he began to grow old so quickly that one day he took the key of the safe and opened it to see what had gone wrong. He found that a sort of rust had eaten into his heart until it had become no bigger than the heart of a rabbit.

Yet another friend had hidden his heart in his wardrobe under his fine clothes. But after a time

he went to look at it and he found that the moths had eaten it away until what was left was of little use.

So you may imagine that Rupert was very anxious about where to keep his heart. And while he was still wondering where he should leave it, he heard that war had broken out in the land. A wicked giant who was an enchanter had invaded it with a big army, and the Crown Prince had gathered together a few troops and gone to meet him.

Rupert was very anxious for the safety of the Prince, and he hastened to the front. When he arrived there he found that things were in a very bad way. The Prince and his little band of followers were making a last stand against the giant and his big army. The giant was rushing upon the Prince, whose sword was broken, and he had raised his club to smite the young man to the ground. Rupert had no armour, but suddenly he remembered that he had a removable heart. He plucked it out and threw it right in the giant's face, blinding him for the moment. The Prince had just time to seize a sword from a follower, and before the tyrant could quite recover himself, the young warrior ran him through the body. When the giant's army saw that their chief was slain they turned and fled.

When the battle was over the Prince sent for Rupert to thank him. And Rupert explained how he had just taken out his heart and flung it at the giant's face, and that he was really glad to get rid of it, for now he would be saved the trouble of thinking where to keep it. Thereupon the Prince opened his bosom and showed Rupert that his heart was hanging there beside his own. 'You thought you threw it away,' he said, 'but I caught it and kept it safe.' Then he told the boy that, if he wished, he could leave it there always, and that there it would be perfectly secure, for no one could steal the heart of the Prince, and no one could steal the hearts that lay beside his.

The Christian Year.

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Use of Money.

'Children, how hard it is for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God.'—Mk 10²⁴.

The Christian use of money is a difficult subject. I am not going to talk to you about political

measures or schemes of industrial or social reconstruction. I am going to try and speak to you solely about the attitude of the Christian soul towards money. And what I desire of you as you listen and think is purely and simply this—as unprejudiced and detached an attitude as possible; that is the disposition of people who honestly desire above all things to be real and faithful disciples of Jesus Christ.

1. First, I would ask that it should be frankly recognized that to live and to enjoy one's self in idleness on the toil of others is a totally illegitimate position. Of course I recognize to the full that there are many different kinds of labour, and that the owner of property who really manages his property is labouring; and a man who thinks and studies and writes is labouring quite as truly as any one else and quite as hard; and a woman who manages a household or brings up a family is doing the noblest kind of work. By all means let us broaden our sense of what work means. Nevertheless, 'if a man will not work, neither let him eat.' No man or woman grown to maturity has a right to eat his dinner or her dinner unless he or she earns it; unless he or she feels honestly, 'I have done the work which deserves this dinner; I am a worker who is receiving my necessary sustenance.' Now I believe it would be an immense transformation of our society if the children of what we call the upper classes had this truth ingrained into them. I do not so much mean by particular lessons given to the young—though such lessons might well be given—as by the whole assumption of society; because as I look back upon my own schooldays I feel that any such assumption was infinitely remote. We had, most of us, no doubt at all that we were a class for whom other people were to work and who were to enjoy ourselves to the best of our opportunities. We too might have to work: nevertheless there was no doubt that we were going out into life to get as much enjoyment as we could, and that, as a matter of course, other people were to work for us. And I do not think that spirit is at all dead, and it requires very fundamental eradication. Every boy and girl must be taught that he must justify his existence by labour profitable to society, and any one who fails to do this should be made ashamed of himself.

2. Then, secondly, I am sure that we need to make a great effort of detachment from wealth,

and to learn again the old Christian fear of being rich. We must revive the belief that if we have got what is necessary for our maintenance as far as we are concerned—food and covering, and the necessities of healthy life—we have got all that we can reasonably claim. ‘Having food and covering let us be therewith content.’ There may be more laid upon us. We may have larger responsibilities; we may have riches; but we must cut ourselves free from the desire to be rich. And there would follow, no doubt, from that new attitude towards wealth what our society greatly needs—that is, public instances of the voluntary abandonment of possessions. There are perhaps more instances amongst us to-day of such abandonment of wealth and property, where it can legitimately be renounced, than people are aware of; but there is no public opinion that welcomes them and rejoices in them. That is what we need; then they would be both more abundant and would produce more spiritual effect. Of course there will remain many people who have the responsibilities of property and wealth, and who cannot renounce them. Nevertheless it would be a great thing if we were detached. Our Lord said, ‘Blessed are ye poor’; that is, those who really and voluntarily have nothing of their own; but besides that He said, ‘Blessed are the poor in spirit’; that is, those who are detached from money and the desire for money.

3. And then, thirdly, we need to think fundamentally about the meaning of justice and about the relation of justice to the rights of property. Justice is a divine thing; it means a certain equality among men; not equality of faculty or equality of position or status, but a fundamental equality none the less. It means the equal right of every single man and woman to have the opportunity to make the best of himself or herself. That is a very radical proposition; yet I am sure that the great Christian Church has been right in its best days, in finding here the real principle of justice in the sight of God, before whom certainly every man counts for one and no one counts for more than one. This principle is no enemy to the rights of property in a certain sense. Christianity is not communistic. I cannot conceive a healthy society without private property for use; that indeed seems to me to be involved in the independence and nobility of the individual life. But an almost unrestricted right of property is a

very different thing; and I do claim that our almost unrestricted right of property is hostile to a very fundamental Christian principle. I used, thirty years ago, to have more to do than I have now with certain attempts to reform or rebuild slum property. The unrestricted right of a man to keep property which was injurious and simply a source of widespread degradation seemed to me then, and still seems to me, to be an intolerable evil. And yet not only was that right practically unrestricted, but you could not even find out who the people were who owned the property in the various stages of ownership. They could effectually conceal themselves. Again, that what is confessedly a dangerous trade, like the trade in intoxicating drinks, should be allowed to pursue its way with so little regard to what is obviously the public interest, but simply for private profit—that, I think, is a fundamental and disastrous betrayal of the welfare of society.

We need to reconstruct our whole conception of the right of private property so as to see that it ought confessedly to be restricted and limited by the general interest. Perhaps we have improved in this matter of late years, but there is a great deal of room for improvement still. We need to feel again, with a quite fresh vividness, that the welfare and dignity of persons, the value of every single human life, ought to be a prior object in the eye of the law as compared with the right of property. Money, in fact, is a trust and a responsibility before God and for the general good.

Thus I am quite sure that no Christian ought to be able to invest his money in any concern, without a very bad conscience, unless he has done his best to assure himself that that in which he proposes to invest it is for the public good. Nor can his responsibility end there. His conscience ought not to allow him to retain money in investments without, up to the limits of his power, ascertaining from time to time that his money is being rightly used, and taking what measures he can to protest, if he have reason to believe that it is not being used for the common good. I have in my own small experience found out that even insignificant shareholders can do something by protest, though they represent but a small body of opinion. The point is that we cannot make or retain an investment without responsibility for the use, as regards the general welfare, that it is being put to.¹

¹ Bishop Charles Gore, *Christian Moral Principles*.

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Renewal.

'And the Lord said unto Moses, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first; and I will write upon these tables the words that were in the first tables, which thou brakest.'—Ex' 34¹.

It is quite impossible to read the Bible without being arrested by its promises of renewal to men who have failed. One of the clamant notes in the harmony of the Divine revelation is that which declares to poor, penitent, broken-spirited, heart-sickened men that God restores to them the mercies which they have forfeited; that He renews to them the grace which they have misused; that every day may be one of new beginning to men who have lost their grip and missed their foothold.

Moses comes down from the mount with God's law which is to establish the nation in righteousness. In that awe-inspiring communion of forty days with God he had come to recognize something of his partnership with Jehovah. God had become much more than a name to Moses in those days. He had become to him not only the Law-giver, but the life by which the law alone can be kept. God had become known to him as the controlling power of righteousness, the enemy of all evil, the inspiration of order in every sphere. And under the impulse of that new apprehension he is moved to hot anger and indignation by the failure of the people to see what had become so plain to him—the nature, the character, the claim of God. Under the very shadow of the mount of God, and of his most august and inspiring experience, he shatters the law of God in his indignant zeal.

The failure of Israel was stupendous. The moral catastrophe which overtook the nation when they forsook God, who had so recently brought them out of Egypt, going back in heart to the defilements of the land of their enslavement, is altogether beyond words. But the failure of Moses was infinitely greater. He lost hold of himself, and he lost hold on the laws of God. He sinned not only against Israel, but he sinned against God and against his own experience. Only one thing remained when he had shattered the law of God—only one thing. And that thing was found not alone in his need but in the greatness of God's nature and of God's mercy. Deep answered to deep in that overwhelming hour of Moses's life.

The record of these words of grace, which become more luminous every time we read them, is the record of a grace which is positively immeasurable. 'I will write upon these tables the words which were in the first tables, which thou brakest.' Hence Moses prays under the inspiration of this great word of God, and his prayer is recorded and will be remembered by us all—'Show me thy ways.' How appealing is the diffidence of the man who knows his failings, who has missed the way of God. 'Lord, show me thy ways!' 'Lord, show me thy glory,' he goes on to pray. For he knows he has missed the glory of God, and has lost the track in his blind and headstrong folly.

Let me endeavour to point out the steps by which these blessings were realized by this Man of God, and by which also they may be realized by every one of us.

1. Notice the invitation to 'come up.' 'Come back to the place of your failure, and then,' said God, 'get past it! Come higher up still. Come back to the place where temptation overcame you, where you slipped your moorings and failed; and get right beyond it.' Oh, you who have broken God's law, I am here to proclaim to you in His name that you can get beyond the place of your failure, that you may get higher and nearer to Him than you have ever been, on the warrant of His own assured invitation. 'Come up!' What a rebuke to the hopelessness of the prophet, and what a rekindling of hope by the revelation of the possibility of another chance! It puts spring into his step and faith in his heart. And if similar experience is to be ours we too have got to get back to the primary things in these days—back to the august holiness of God, back to the precious Blood of Jesus Christ, back to the promises of God, eternal as His own nature which is our ultimate security. We have to hearken and respond anew to God's loving invitation.

2. You will notice, in the second place, it is prescribed that he comes up alone, that no man is to come up with him. This is an adventure which he must make in solitary confidence in the God who has called him. This is to be an experience in the life of Moses which supersedes everything else by its sheer necessity. Hence with considerable detail—all pointing to the same meaning—direction is given as to his approach and

ascent of the mount. There will be subsequent relationships with men; he will have a great deal to do with flocks and herds in the days, to come. But for the present good of his own soul and the immediate readjustment of an outraged relationship, he must 'come up' alone. I venture to say to you that you will never find what you most need in the crowd. Get up into the mount with God. Face God! Take yourself ruthlessly in hand! Let every other interest in life be superseded by the supreme necessity of this one thing—to recover your lost ground and to regain your forfeited fellowship with high Heaven.

3. A third thing claims our attention—that God gives him the assurance of a renewal which shall carry him infinitely further than his original experience. For listen to what God says to him: 'I will make all my goodness pass before thee; I will be gracious unto thee, and will show mercy. I will put thee in a cleft of the rock, and cover thee with the shadow of my hand; and then I will write upon these tables which you bring up to me in contrition and repentance the words which were on the first ones.' Do you not see what it all means—that God covenants to give him a new copy of a dishonoured gospel, but with a new and sanctifying sense of the goodness, the grace, the mercy, which constitute His glory? This is the blessing that awaits us; nothing less—and there can be nothing more—than a new copy of a dishonoured gospel, and this time written not as an outward law which we may read and forget, but 'in their minds I will write it, and in their hearts I will put it.' A gospel, yea; but a gospel reinforced with an experience of Divine love which shall convert for us all its precepts into possibilities and all its light into life.

The outcome of this incident was that Moses went down from the mount with the supporting inspiration that God had trusted him despite everything. And that inspiration was such a living thing, such a resurgence within his being, that his face shone from the inner radiance of his life, and 'he wist not that his face shone.' And it is ever the man of the mount who will be the light of the darkness below. It is the man whose own experience of God has been renewed in the sanctity of silence who will go forth to bless men in His Name, unconsciously reflecting a radiance which none can miss and none can mistake.¹

¹ J. Stuart Holden, *Your Reasonable Service*.

TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Three Voices.

'Day unto day uttereth speech,
And night unto night sheweth knowledge.
There is no speech nor language;
Their voice is not heard.
Their line is gone out through all the earth.'

Ps 19²⁻⁴.

We may speak of the three voices of Nature, meaning the impulses that come from the three-fold—practical, emotional, and intellectual—relation between Man and Nature. These are the wordless voices referred to in the nineteenth Psalm: 'Day unto day is welling forth speech, and night unto night is breathing out knowledge; there *is* no speech, and there *are* no words; their voice has no audible sound; yet it resonates over all the earth.' The three voices are: Endeavour, Enjoy, Enquire. The first voice is Endeavour. What would our hereditary character be without Nature's millennial sifting of the insurgent, the adventurous, the controlled, the far-sighted, the strenuous? And the discipline is still binding. There is no doubt as to Nature's condemnation of the unlit lamp and the ungirt loin. 'One of the obvious lessons of evolution is the danger of having things made too easy!

The second voice is Enjoy. As we come to know Nature, we find that everything is wonderful. 'You of any well that springs may unfold the heaven of things.' 'It is enough if through Thy grace I've found naught common on Thy Earth. Take not that vision from my ken.' As we begin to feel more at home our wonder grows into what may almost be called affection. This is true of those who have what Meredith called 'love exceeding a simple love of the things that glide in grasses and rubble of woody wreck.' Science never destroys wonder or delight, but only shifts it higher or deeper. As Coleridge said, 'All knowledge begins and ends with wonder, but the first wonder is the child of ignorance, while the second is the parent of adoration.' We need to listen to this second voice which says Wonder, Enjoy, Revere. It was one whose life was far from being all roses who said:

To make this Earth our hermitage,
A cheerful and a changeful page,
God's bright and intricate device
Of days and seasons doth suffice.

The third voice is Enquire. From the first Nature has been setting man problems, leading him gradually on from the practical to the more abstract. Lafcadio Hearn tells us that in the house of any old Japanese family the guest is likely to be shown some of the heirlooms. 'A pretty little box, perhaps, will be set before you. Opening it you will see only a beautiful silk bag, closed with a silk running-cord decked with tiny tassels. . . . You open the bag and see within it another bag of a different quality of silk, but very fine. Open that, and lo! a third, which contains a fourth, which contains a fifth, which contains a sixth, which contains a seventh bag, which contains the strongest, roughest, hardest vessel of Chinese clay that you ever beheld; yet it is not only curious but precious; it may be more than a thousand years old.' Indeed it is more than clay; there is an idea in it.

Natural science has to do with a similar process of unwrapping; it opens the beautiful box, it removes one silken envelope after another, trying at the same time to unravel the pattern and count the threads—and what is finally revealed is something very old and wonderful—the stuff out of which worlds have been spun—'a handful of dust which God enchants.' For we must see the scientific Common Denominator in the light of the philosophic Greatest Common Measure.

Varying the metaphor, one of the foremost investigators, Sif J. J. Thomson, writes: 'As we conquer peak after peak we see in front of us regions full of interest and beauty, but we do not see our goal, we do not see the horizon. In the distance tower still higher peaks, which will yield to those who ascend them still wider prospects, and deepen the feeling, the truth of which is emphasized by every advance in science, that "Great are the Works of the Lord."'

These are the three voices of Nature. She joins hands with us, and says, *Struggle, Endeavour*. She comes close to us, we hear her heart beating; she says, *Wonder, Enjoy, Revere*. She whispers secrets to us, we cannot always catch her words; she says, *Search, Enquire*. These three voices appeal to Hand and Heart and Head, to the trinity of our being. In listening to them we may be disciplined to hear even more august voices. Man's struggles for food and foothold have often helped him to much higher reaches of endeavour; to be thrilled with beauty may be a step to loving goodness; to try to find out scientifically what is

true in Nature may be the beginning of waiting patiently upon the Lord. But our point is that to listen to the three voices of Nature is in itself worth while. It is a necessary and natural discipline of the developing human spirit.

We are familiar with the story of a rugged and very human Hebrew prophet, who after severe discipline climbed a mountain and heard the three voices of Nature. First there was a great and strong wind—a symbol of the practical voice, surely, which commands man to build his house upon a rock, and to struggle against the storm, which teaches the sailor to trim his sails and the husbandman to prepare for the rain. Second there was an earthquake—a symbol of the emotional voice, surely, for is there anything so awful that stirs man and beast more deeply, that moves us down to the primeval bed-rock of human nature laid down in the time of the cave-dwellers. Third, there was the fire—a symbol of the scientific voice, surely, for the fire of science burns up rubbish, melts out the gold, reduces things to a common denominator, and gives light to man. Now it seemed to the prophet that God was not in the wind, nor in the earthquake, nor in the fire; and it seems strictly correct to say that listening to the three voices of Nature is not in itself religious, but it is a good thing to listen, and it may form a preparation for religion. It was so in the prophet's case, for after the echoes of the wind and the earthquake and the fire had died away, he heard a still, small voice—God's voice—a sound of gentle stillness, the margin says, which spoke very incisively to him. It was a great experience to the prophet to have heard the three voices of Nature, but it meant more for him practically to hear the still, small voice. And it may be that in *obeying* it he understood afterwards that God *was* in the other voices too.

So when we pass from the cold evening-light of science, which the schoolmen called *cognitio vespertina*, to the morning-light of religion, which they called *cognitio matutina*, we may be able to agree with Ruskin's fine words (engraved on the memorial at Keswick): 'The Spirit of God is around you in the air that you breathe, His glory in the light that you see, and in the fruitfulness of the earth and the joy of its creatures He has written for you day by day His revelation, and He has granted you day by day your daily bread.'¹

¹ J. Arthur Thomson, *The System of Animate Nature*.

TWENTY-FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Church and the Kingdom.

'Thy kingdom come.'—Mt 6¹⁰.

There are two distinct elements which appear to be necessary in any adequate idea of the Kingdom of God. First, there is the sovereign inward rule of God in the individual hearts and characters of men, and secondly there is an external order and process whereby human society is visibly redeemed and transformed. These two elements are in fact hardly separable. They are intermingled all through Scripture, and appear to be complementary to one another in our Lord's teaching. Perhaps He spoke most often of the inward qualities of character which belong to the Kingdom in contrast to the crudeness and secularism of current ideas. But, on the other hand, the Incarnation itself is a perpetual reminder to us that however spiritual the forces of the Kingdom may be, the measure of their sway over men mainly depends upon the degree in which they can be expressed in concrete visible forms. Now these different elements of the Kingdom actually made their appearance as realized facts in the Apostolic Church. A new secret of inner life flowering into new manifestations of character, and embodied in a new kind of human fellowship with its own developing forms of outward order: this was what now appeared as a present reality having the marks of a new creation in which were stored untold resources for the redemption of mankind.

1. The Catholic Church received from our Lord the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. In her are established the well-springs of grace through His indwelling Spirit. By these alone can man be reunited to God, renewed in His nature and made responsive to the divine claims upon his life. The Church thus possesses the secret of personal character, the vital power by which the Kingdom grows. In the apostolic writings we see how the two chief characteristics of the Kingdom are fused together. The rule of God in the heart liberates personality. Inwardly this means an enrichment of life by contact with God, opening out unlimited possibilities for the unfolding of individual gifts and graces. But this inward development provides the very material out of which a true social life can grow. The growth of personal character, as described in the New Testament, is one which through renunciation of self-seeking tendencies passes to a higher

level, where man finds increasing satisfaction in contributing his share to the common life of his fellow-men. Each one contributes something unique, and in so doing he exercises his proper function in the corporate life of the Body. Perhaps we may even say that the test of personal salvation in the apostolic religion appears in this attainment of function within the Body. We cannot reach the full stature of Christian personality except through a process of fitting into and contributing to the corporate life. It is important to observe the exact adjustment of the resources of the Kingdom as we find them in the Church, for there is a wider manifestation of the Kingdom which can be understood only in the light of this adjustment.

The manifestation of the Kingdom in the Church is seen to be first of all an inward mystical process of character-formation, which achieves itself in an intense social life. But this process does *not* create that social life, for it needs social forms already existing into which it can flow. The social structure of the Church had to be originally given before the process could begin. The inward dynamic of grace and its ethical fruits required a visible Body, as truly a divine gift as itself. And more than this was needed and was bestowed. The visible Body itself, the partner of such intense inward life, required for its support the divinely given authority of the Apostolic Ministry and its due continuance. For if the rule of God is to be in the heart of man, and if his life fructifies only in the social order of the Body, then the rule of God must visibly preside over that same order in an unmistakable way. The Kingdom can have full sway over the individual life only if the individual recognizes the imprint of divine authority over that external order to which he belongs.

2. These are permanent principles of the Kingdom of God. They appear in the Church as unique, divinely bestowed gifts. But in *some* form they must appear and be recognized in any manifestation of the Kingdom in human society as a whole; for they are really written upon the heart of man and upon the divine order of the world. It is this wider development of the Kingdom which we must now consider. From what has been said it will be clear that the Church as the typical, central, divinely-given embodiment of the Kingdom is the indispensable organ through which alone any further manifestation of the Kingdom can come. If this is so, the visible Church here

on earth cannot be regarded as an end in itself. It is an outward order over which, in spite of all imperfections, Christ manifestly reigns here and now. It witnesses and ministers to His inward reign over human hearts here and now. Yet it embodies a forecast and a prophecy of still greater things to come. For the end to which the processes of the Kingdom have been set in motion is not the individual salvation of a minority of souls, but nothing less than the redemption of the whole human race, and the recovery of all the riches of God's creation from the ruin into which it has fallen. Let us then consider the principles by which the Church's vocation as organ of the Kingdom must be realized in the world.

(1) The first and most important of these is the distinction between the Church and the world, and between the ends which they respectively seek. As against the cult of happiness and earthly peace the Church sets heavenly beatitude and the peace of God and His saints as the proper end of man. Her witness is to 'the kingdom of the heavens' which is not of this world—a Kingdom which has already come down from God out of heaven as a divine gift, and which at the end of time will finally be manifested in its perfection beyond this world-order by the mighty power of God. It has always been a deep-rooted Christian conviction that there can be no finality about any outward ordering of this world, and that the final reign of God and the saints belongs to a life which will be ushered in after this world has run its course. But that 'other world' not only reaches forward beyond the stretch of time which measures this earthly process. It also surrounds us now; and it is this which distinguishes Christian activity from worldly activity, even when both appear to be aiming at the same immediate results. Whatever the process, the one seeks supernatural ends, the other some earthly achievement. Renunciation of earth for heaven is the primary mark of Christian conduct, determining the relation of the Church to the world. The incarnation of God meant the descent to earth of a heaven-born Life whose energies could only fructify for us through deliberate renunciation on the Cross of that earth-born life into which it came. And so it must always

be; only poverty and meekness can inherit the earth. The martyrs died and the Roman Empire entered the Church. Monks fled into the wilderness and the wilderness blossomed into mediæval Christendom. The Cross is followed by the Resurrection.

(2) That brings us to another principle involved in the Church's mission to the world. Our Lord came into the world to redeem it from corruption to a new life of consecration. 'For God sent not his Son into the world to judge the world, but that the world through him might be saved.' The principle of the Resurrection is the principle of a new life which has conquered the world by renouncing it, and which, being itself consecrated by that sacrifice, possesses power to redeem all the natural riches of the human social order from worldly perversion and waste, and to raise them to the level of consecration, where they become a sacrifice acceptable to God. To redeem the world, however, is a more difficult task than to renounce it. At first sight, indeed, it seems to mean something fairly straightforward—the work of gathering souls into the Church by individual conversion and baptism, and then the task of building up their characters by sacramental grace until they become knit into their place in the Body of Christ, and contribute to the mystical fellowship of the common life in the Church. That is a process of assimilation by which human lives are gathered out of the corrupt society of the world, and placed in a better society. And when they come they bring with them all the natural gifts and tendencies and varieties of human personality, which have hitherto contributed to an organized life outside the Church. For the supernatural resources of the Kingdom, to which the Church holds the key, require material upon which to act; and the material upon which they act is always natural human material, only regenerated to a new use. Moreover, this is not simply a process of saving individual souls; for, as we have seen, the Church itself is a distinct social structure, into which all this consecrated human material is built.¹

¹ L. S. Thornton, 'The Kingdom of God,' in *Report of the First Anglo-Catholic Congress*.

The Latest Results of Old Testament Archaeology.

BY PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, D.LITT., LL.D., OXFORD.

DURING the last thirty years excavators have been busy in the Near East, where discovery has crowded upon discovery. Many of these have a more or less direct bearing upon the Old Testament, its history, its credibility, its theology, and its composition.

The discovery of the Tel el-Amarna tablets in 1887 placed the Pentateuchal problems in a new light. They proved the antiquity of the literary use of writing as well as the wide-spread character of education and the means of intercommunication in the pre-Mosaic age. They further revealed the fact that the literary script and language of Western Asia before the Davidic era was Assyrian.

Then came the discovery of the legal Code of Hammurabi, which testified to the early existence of a highly developed code of laws which were enforced not only in Babylonia, but also in the Babylonian provinces of Syria and Palestine. Traces of these laws, it was soon pointed out, are discoverable in the Book of Genesis.

The next discovery of importance which bore upon Old Testament criticism was that of the cuneiform records of Boghaz-Keui, the Cappadocian capital of the Hittite empire. These were excavated by Winckler in 1907, and some of the chief historical results were published by him in a provisional report in the *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*, 35, December 1907. At the same time the German Oriental Society was also undertaking exhaustive excavations at Kalat Sher-gat, the ancient Assur, where the royal library was found, a predecessor of that afterwards brought together by Assur-bani-pal at Nineveh.

In Palestine the excavations of Dr. Bliss on the site of Lachish, and of Professor Macalister at Gezer, furnished us for the first time with the results of scientific exploration in that country, and were supplemented by the German excavations at Megiddo and those of Dr. Sellin at Jericho. These were followed in 1913-14 by the excavations of Capt. Weill at Jerusalem, at the expense of Baron de Rothschild, which have given us at last a scientific basis for the reconstruction of the earlier history of the Jewish capital.

The outbreak of the war, however, put a sudden

stop to the activities of the European archaeologists and the international intercourse which alone made any utilization of their results possible. It was not until 1919, therefore, that scholars generally came to know what had been found in the years immediately preceding the war, or that a time came for a renewal of the publication of cuneiform and other texts. We are only now beginning to learn something about the contents of the texts from Boghaz-Keui and Assur.

In the first place, new light is beginning to be thrown upon the Hebrew language of the Old Testament. It is becoming increasingly manifest that it was a literary and to a certain extent artificial language, like the official Hittite of Boghaz-Keui which was there termed 'the Language of the Scribes,' or the official language of Assyria, which would more correctly be called Babylonian rather than Assyrian. Literary Hebrew was based and modelled on Babylonian, which, until the Davidic era, was the literary language of all Western Asia, and it is consequently full of Babylonian words and idioms. Until these have been set apart and thoroughly investigated, our knowledge of Hebrew philology must remain as empirical as it has been in the past. Professor Naville has even been contending from the Egyptological point of view that what we call Hebrew was never a colloquial language, the colloquial language being an Aramaic dialect which is called 'Jewish' in 2 K 18²⁶.¹ But this ignores the fact that in Is 19¹⁸ Hebrew is identified with 'the language of Canaan,' that is to say, Phœnician, and in Gn 31⁴⁷ the line of division between spoken Aramaic and spoken 'Hebrew' is drawn at Mizpah.

Closely connected with this question is that of the composition and dating of the Old Testament books. Here the Elephantine papyri, which have incidentally settled the date of Sanballat, have shown that the laws relating to the institution of the Passover must go back to the pre-Exilic age.²

¹ *L'Évolution de la Langue égyptienne et les Langues Sémitiques*, 1920.

² *Expositor*, August 1911, pp. 98 sqq.; Daiches in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, Jan. 1912, pp. 17 sqq.

More recently Professor Langdon has discovered the origin and signification of the technical musical terms found in the titles of the Psalms; they came from Babylonia and are of great antiquity. As the meaning of them had been forgotten in the Maccabean epoch, if not earlier, it is plain that the Psalms, in the titles of which they occur, cannot be later than the Exilic period.¹

Considerable portions of what Professor Langdon calls 'the Babylonian Job' have also been discovered, and he is now employed in editing them. They show that an old Babylonian work lies behind our canonical Book of Job. They also show that the prologue and epilogue belong to the original work, and so cast grave doubt on the value of a critical method which pronounces them to be later additions.

On the historical side we now know that the Hittites exercised a profound influence upon Palestine in the Mosaic Age, if not earlier, and that consequently there was good reason for Heth being named next in succession to Sidon 'the first-born' of Canaan in Gn 10¹⁵. Hittite soldiers and mercenaries garrisoned the country or were allies of the Amorites, and their leaders became the governors and kinglets of the Canaanite cities. The king of Jerusalem was of Hittite origin, and his enemies, the Khabiri, were the bodyguard of the Hittite king.² Words like *kohen*, 'priest,' were borrowed from the Hittite languages, and it is probable that the phonetic change of *u* (*w*) into *i* (*y*) is to be traced to the same source. I have pointed out³ that the name given to the Jebusite Hittite Araunah, which the Hebrew scribes found such a difficulty in spelling, is the Hittite *arawanis*, 'a nobleman,' which explains the gloss in 2 S 24²³ (המלך). On the religious side the *asyla*, or 'cities of refuge,' were an old institution of Asia Minor, closely connected with Asianic forms of religion, and it is possible that the original conception of the Scape-goat belongs to Asia Minor rather than to Babylonia. At all events it was an institution of old standing in the country.⁴

The dominant religious influence, however, among the Western Semites, or Amorites as the Babylonians entitled them, was naturally Baby-

lonian. Even the name of Yahveh can no longer be confined to the Israelites. We find it among the Amorite settlers in Babylonia in the Abrahamic age and earlier, and its origin and meaning had already been forgotten. Strictly speaking, Yahveh, written *Yāwa* in the cuneiform, was the feminine of *Yahu*, *Yau*; when the feminine deity was absorbed by the masculine, as was also the case with Assur in Assyria and Chemosh in Moab, the masculine form survived only in proper names, while the feminine form was retained in the literary language. Various attempts were made by the Babylonian scribes to explain the name, the favourite one being that which identified *Yau* or *Yahu* with the Babylonian *yan*, 'myself.' Sometimes, however, the lexicographers were content with making it the equivalent of 'god' and 'lord.'⁵

The French excavations at Jerusalem have finally cleared up the difficulties connected with the early topography of the city and brought to light the primitive Zion or City of David. This was the Jebusite city, standing on the hill immediately to the south of the Temple-Mount and now generally known as Ophel. Here were the Jebusite citadel and the palace of David, whose tomb along with those of his successors was on its western slope. On the Temple-Mount was another city, Salem, called *Uru-Salim*, 'the City of Salem,' in the Tel el-Amarna tablets, which had been built by the Babylonians to protect the road running from the naphtha springs of the Dead Sea. Outside the walls of Salem was the ancient sanctuary of the neolithic population of Palestine, which consisted of a double cave as on other sites which have been excavated. In the reign of Solomon the two cities were enclosed by a single line of fortification, the space between them being filled up by what was termed the *Millo*, or 'Filling.' The water from the Virgin's Spring—the only source of water-supply in the immediate neighbourhood—was brought into the city by an aqueduct, partly subterranean, cut in the rock; in the time of Hezekiah this was superseded by the more effective 'Siloam tunnel,' which was the high-water mark of Jewish engineering.⁶

¹ *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, April 1921, pp. 169 sqq.

² 'Hittite Texts from Tablets in the British Museum,' 6. 18, 37. 4, 5.

³ *Journal of Theological Studies*, April 1921, p. 267.

⁴ THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, March 1920, p. 283.

⁵ So in C. T. xviii. 8, 9 sqq. *Yāu* and *Yahu* are stated to be synonyms of *danadu*, *rabu*, *rabawu*, *bīru*, *nēru*, *mamlu*, and 'among the Amorites' of *bahulu*, which is interpreted *rubū*, 'prince.'

⁶ See Weill, *La Cité de David*, 1920, and my article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

On the borderland of the Old Testament we have a very remarkable Babylonian text from the library of Assur, which has been published by Professor Zimmern, with translation and notes.¹ It contains the stage directions for a 'miracle play' which was performed in the temple of Bel-Merodach at Babylon every New Year's Day. Bel, we are told, was bound and brought before the tribunal which awaits mankind at the river of Death. After being 'wounded,' he was condemned and led away to execution. Along with him a malefactor was executed, while a second malefactor, if Professor Zimmern's translation is correct, was released in accordance, it would seem, with custom. After the descent of the god into the prison-house of death, his clothes were laid before Istar, and the city of Babylon was plunged in confusion and darkness. Then a goddess washed away the blood which had flowed from a wound in

¹ 'Zum babylonischen Neujahrsfest,' ii., in *Berichte über die Verhandlungen d. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Heft 5, 1918. Reviewed by me in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, July 1921, p. 440.

the side of the dead god. His tomb was now watched by a 'son of Assur,' while his priests lamented for him, and a goddess sought his grave. Eventually he rose again from the dead, and so became the saviour who 'raises the dead to life.'

In reviewing Zimmern's monograph, I drew attention to a fragmentary text from Nineveh which had been published by Dr. Pinches in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* in 1908. Owing to the fragmentary condition of the tablet it was impossible to explain it at the time; the Assur text now shows that it gives us the wording of the miracle play. We are told in it how Bel-Merodach 'descended into hell' and there 'the spirits who were in prison' 'rejoiced to see him,' while he addressed or preached to the rulers of Hades. It is evident that we have here the Babylonian original of the apocryphal writing quoted in 1 P 3¹⁹, which seems to have been a very literal rendering of its prototype. Even the reference to Noah is explained by the fact that the *abubu*, or 'deluge,' was the weapon of Merodach.

Contributions and Comments.

Genesis xxxvii. 28.

IN the *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* for 1918, vol. lxxii. pp. 87-110, there is an article by Professor E. König, called 'Neueste Fragen der Pentateuchkritik' (Latest Problems of Pentateuch Criticism). It is almost exclusively occupied with an endeavour to show that the story of Joseph is a compilation from more than one source. On p. 99, § 5, he sums up. He claims to have shown that there are two series of statements:

(a) 37^{22b} Reuben wished to take Joseph back to his father: v.^{28a αβ} Midianites drew Joseph out of the pit; v.²⁹ Reuben alone expressed grief over Joseph's disappearance; v.³⁶ Midianites sold Joseph to Potiphar; 40¹⁵ Joseph was *stolen* out of the land of the Hebrews; 42^{22a αβγ} Reuben has warned the brethren. None of these passages say anything of Joseph being sold by the brethren.

(b) 37²⁵⁻²⁷ Judah proposes to sell Joseph to Ishmaelites; v.^{28a γδ} the brethren (except Reuben)

sold Joseph to Ishmaelites, and these brought Joseph to Egypt; 39¹ Ishmaelites sold Joseph to Potiphar; 42²¹ the brethren (except Reuben) felt guilty of Joseph's disappearance; 45⁴ the brethren sold Joseph.

If this were a fair specimen of the Higher Criticism, we should be justified in rejecting the latter without hesitation; for the result is obtained by wilful misrepresentation of the text.

Ch. 37²⁸ runs (R.V.), after the presence of the Ishmaelites has been mentioned: *And there passed by Midianites, merchantmen; and they drew and lifted Joseph out of the pit, and sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites for twenty pieces of silver.* Professor König arbitrarily interpolates, after the words "the pit, and," *the brethren except Reuben!*

The statements that, according to 40¹⁵, Joseph was stolen and, according to 45⁴, the brethren sold Joseph are inaccurate. There was a sound canon of Homeric criticism: "not everything said in Homer is said by Homer." The assertions are not by the author but by Joseph, in one case

speaking to a stranger, in the other reproaching his brethren. His statements are likely to have been accommodated to the situations.

The last verse of ch. 37 is wrongly rendered in the R.V., *And the Midianites sold him*. Since the form of the sentence is not consecutive, it should be rendered as a summary of what preceded, with an anticipation of what is to follow. While Jacob was bewailing him as dead, *he had been sold by the Midianites*, and was on his way to Egypt to Potiphar.

Now the narrative may be history, or it may be fiction. In the former case it must go back to Joseph and his brethren, who between them knew the facts: and those with which we are here concerned involve no improbability. In the latter case the author has been devising expedients, and we may apply Aristotle's test of unity: if a detail were omitted, would it be missed? If it would be missed, then the narrative is a unity.

Joseph has to be brought into Egypt: expedient, his brethren's jealousy. If they kill him, he will not get to Egypt: expedient, Reuben's desire to restore him safely to his father. Hence when the brethren propose to kill him and fling him into a pit, Reuben prevails on them to place him in a pit (of his own, Reuben's, choice) alive. The difficulty remains, what is to be done with him? and the arrival of the Ishmaelites suggests to Judah the idea of selling Joseph to them, which he communicates to the brethren (v.²⁷). Clearly this will not meet the views of Reuben, who wishes to take him home; either, then, he will frustrate the scheme in some way, so that Joseph will not be taken to Egypt; or he will report the proceeding to Jacob, who will endeavour to trace his favourite son. Further difficulties will arise with regard to the division of the price, and such a secret being kept by ten men. The plot will only work out if the brethren themselves are ignorant of his fate, and are all involved in it; for even Reuben is responsible for his being placed in the pit.

Since, then, he must be sold, that he may be brought to Egypt, and the brethren cannot sell him, the sale must be effected by some one else; the expedient is the Midianites, who anticipate the brethren by kidnapping him and selling him to the Ishmaelites. The latter, as prospective purchasers, will not get the chance of kidnapping him themselves, as their movements will be watched. The pit, however, is at a distance ('in the wilderness,' 37²²), so that the Midianites can kidnap him

without the brethren's knowledge. Reuben, who knows its location, is naturally the person who goes to fetch Joseph, and becomes aware of his disappearance. From the statement that he rent his clothes we are by no means justified in inferring that the other brethren were not disconcerted. If Joseph had retained his wonderful coat, that would have rendered him easy to trace; the use of it as a means of proving his death is therefore admirably thought out, whether by the brethren or by the author.

By the expedient of the Ishmaelites the author brings Joseph to Egypt; by that of the Midianites he silences Reuben and renders the brethren ignorant of Joseph's fate. He has further provided an answer to the question how the brethren meant to dispose of Joseph; the question how Reuben would have frustrated them is left unanswered, and does not really require an answer. Professor König would scarcely have been thanked by the author for spoiling his carefully constructed story or carefully recorded narrative.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

Oxford.

Changes of Scenery in Luke.

IT has often been observed that in telling the story of the paralytic at Capernaum, after Mark's narrative in 2¹⁻¹², Luke has used terms which fit, not the flat-roofed Galilæan house which Mark has in view, but the Græco-Roman house with which he was himself familiar. In Lk 5¹⁹ the bearers of the invalid do not 'dig through' the roof, but simply let down the stretcher 'through the tiles.' *Διὰ τῶν κεράμων* is the equivalent of the Latin *per tegulas*, which regularly refers to the rectangular opening in the roof, called *impluvium*, through which rain-water found its way into a cistern sunk in the floor of the *atrium*. It was a familiar means of surreptitious entrance. Cicero accuses Antony of having taken this way into the presence of his boon-companion Curio, after Curio's father had forbidden him the house: 'Quotiens te pater ejus domu sua ejecit, quotiens custodes posuit ne limen intrares! Cum tu tamen nocte socia, hortante libidine, cogente mercede *per tegulas dimitterere*' (*Phil.* ii. 18. 45).

Less attention has been given to a similar change of scene in the Lucan report of the saying about the lamp and the bushel. According to

Mt 5¹⁵ the lamp is lit and placed not under the meal-tub but on a lamp-stand, and then 'it gives light to all in the house.' That is, we are to think of a cottage with but one living-room, in which the whole family is gathered in the evening. Luke, on the other hand, who gives the saying twice, in slightly varying forms (8¹⁶, 11⁸⁸), each time says that the lamp is placed on the stand 'in order that those who are entering in may see the light.' That is to say, he is thinking of the light placed in the vestibule or *ostium* of a Græco-Roman house, for the convenience of visitors. On grounds of purely literary criticism there is no means of saying with certainty whether the Matthæan or the Lucan form is here the more original, for in the Marcan form of the saying (4²¹) the clause about the purpose of the light is absent. Matthew and Luke must therefore have obtained it from a common source which has perished, unless, as is less likely, each added the clause out of his own fancy. But on grounds of general probability we should have little hesitation in saying that the form of the saying applicable to a Galilæan 'but-and-ben' is more likely to be original than the form adapted to a house with a vestibule.

In Luke, therefore, the artist and 'man of the world,' we discern already that process at work which later led the Italian painters of the Renaissance to depict Biblical personages in the fashions and surroundings of their own times, and which in our own day is producing those clever Chinese illustrations of the parables in which the manners of contemporary China are so charmingly reflected.

Somewhat similar is Luke's treatment of the short parable given in Mk 3²⁷. Here we have an account of a burglary. The burglar has his eye on a certain house, but he knows that the householder is a stark man of his hands, who will give short shrift to any marauder found on his premises. He therefore uses subtlety, comes upon the strong man unawares and ties him up. Then, under his indignant eyes, he plunders his gear at leisure. Luke reports this parable, probably not directly after Mark, for it occurs in a context where he seems to be following another source (11²¹⁻²²). Nevertheless that it is the same story in origin is clear. But it works out very differently. Here the strong man is an armed warrior who stands on guard in the courtyard of his castle. All goes well until a still more doughty warrior approaches, and

challenges him to combat. The stranger overthrows the guardian of the fortress and despoils him of his armour. The champion vanquished and disarmed, the castle lies at the mercy of the raider, who distributes the treasures of the house among his freebooting followers. We might be reading a Border ballad! And may not the Roman borders have been the scene of such incidents, especially on the desert frontier of the Syrian province, where a foray of Bedawin was always a possibility? At all events it is clear that while the Marcan story is about a civilian overpowered by a burglar, the Lucan story is about an armed warrior defending his 'courtyard' from attack. Again we have no means of deciding, purely on grounds of literary criticism, which of the two versions is the more original, for we do not know how closely Luke is reproducing his source, nor how early that source may have been. But the change of scene from the homely environment of civil life to the 'clash of arms' suggests that the imagination of the far-travelled Greek physician has dealt with his source as it dealt with Mark in the paralytic story, and moulded afresh the 'scenery' of his narrative.

C. HAROLD DODD.

Mansfield College, Oxford.

‘When he had tasted’ (Matt. xxvii. 34).

IN his very interesting note in the June number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES Dr. Willcock suggests that the explanation of our Saviour's tasting the narcotic wine, although He refused to drink it, is that He was making 'a gracious acknowledgment of the kindly purpose of those who prepared and presented the draught.'

I am convinced that this is the true explanation. Since reading the note I have consulted on the point several commentaries and Lives of Christ, and find that, although most writers give no explanation or a very unsatisfactory one of the incident, there are at least three expositors who have reached the same conclusion as Dr. Willcock. Thus:

Dean Plumptre—'The "tasting" implied a recognition of the kindly purpose of the act' (*Ellicott's Commentary*).

Dr. F. N. Peloubet—"When he had tasted thereof"—recognising this beautiful act of kind-

ness' (Commentary published by Oxford University Press).

W. J. Deane—'He accepted the kindly offer so far as to put His lips to it' (*Pulpit Commentary*).

ERNEST ELLIOT.

Manchester.

The Disciple whom Jesus loved.

IT may be just worth while to record that my studies during the past few months have led me to the conclusion reached by the Rev. B. Grey Griffith in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May, and for the same reasons. In *The Master of Life* (1912) I tried to show the critical importance of Lazarus in the closing months of Christ's life, and I have become convinced that the points mentioned by Mr. Grey Griffith are capable of even more emphasis than he has placed upon them. Two points of dissent:

(1) I do not see that 'another disciple' of 18¹⁵ need be identified with the beloved disciple. This man, otherwise unknown to us, is one of the priestly caste from whom adherents were already being gained. Their significance has not yet been duly estimated.

(2) I take 21²⁴ to refer to the whole Gospel: I am coming to think that the solution of its authorship is that it is the work of Lazarus issued (and perhaps edited) by the Apostle John—or that other John, beloved of critics!

I would add that the name 'the Disciple whom Jesus loved' has never received any interpretation. Jesus loved many. *But this man's relation to Jesus centred and was contained in this one thing: personal affection.* So he was not one of the Twelve. The story begins, I think, in Mk 10²¹—Jesus loved him at sight—the young ruler was Lazarus.

F. WARBURTON LEWIS.

Rickmansworth.

ἐπιούσιον—its origin and sense.

THE note in the June number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES by the Rev. D. T. James, M.A., Wrexham, is valuable, because it establishes, beyond reasonable doubt, what is the most likely derivation of this rather puzzling word—not from ἡ ἐπιούσα [ἡμέρα], meaning to-morrow's bread, but from ἐπί, combined with οὐσία, which means existence, food

for existence, for sustaining life, and, by implication, sufficient food, necessary sustenance. This, I observe, is the view held by the Rev. J. B. M'Clellan in his valuable, and not yet superseded, *Translation of the Gospels*—his rendering of Mt 6¹¹ and of Lk 11³ being 'Give us to-day our needful bread,' and 'Give us day by day our needful bread.'

There is little or nothing in the objection that the derivation we incline to would require not ἐπιούσιον but ἐπούσιον. This, though urged by some minutely grammatical sticklers, does not seem to merit any serious attention. Surely it is too much to expect that a person speaking, or writing, in a foreign language should be cognizant of so minute a usage as the dropping of a single vowel, however called for by analogy the usage in question may be. For using either ἐπούσιον or ἐπιούσιον he could not reasonably at least be blamed.

P. THOMSON.

Dunning.

The Pufflicans.

FRESH light is thrown upon the τελῶναι of the New Testament by a papyrus which was dug up by Grenfell and Hunt in Harit (Theadelphia) and is published by them in the volume entitled *Fayum Towns and their Papyri*. The Papyrus (No. 21) is an edict from the Præfect Mamertinus of date A.D. 134, denouncing a corrupt practice whereby government officials and perhaps creditors in general were refusing to allow those from whom money was due to pay off their debts before the expiration of the prescribed legal period, unless they themselves received a bribe.

The passage with which we are concerned runs as follows:

Ἦ. 'νυνεὶ δὲ συνλήβδ[ην π]ερὶ πάντων ὁπωσοῦν διδομένων Ἦ. . . Ἦ ἡ λογιζομένων εἰς τὸ δημόσιον εἶτ' ἐν γένεσιν εἶτ' ἐν ἀργυρίῳ εἶτ' ἐν σωματικαῖς ἐργασίαις ἢ ἄλλῳ ὁπωδήτινι τρόπῳ κελεύω παρέχειν ἀλλή[λοις] ἀποχὰς τοὺς τε διδόντας καὶ τοὺς λαμβάν[ο]ντας, ἐπεξελευσόμενος ἂν τις ἄλλα παρὰ ταῦτα ποιήσας. ἐπ' ἐρὶ δὲ καὶ τοῦτό τινες ἐμνήσαντο ὡς αὐτοὶ μὲν τὰ βιβλία προσφέροντες ο[ἱ]ς ὀφίλουσιν, ἐκίνοῦς δὲ μὴ βουλομένους παρ' αὐτῶν λαμβάνειν ἵνα τὴν παρολκὴν ἐξωνήσωνται τῷ τοῦ προστίμου φόβῳ δυνήσωνται μαρτυρίαν ποιήσασθαι περὶ τῶν μὴ προειμένων (οἱ l. προσιεμένων) οἱ μὴ διδόν[τε]ς [ὅ]πως τῆς ἀποθίας ἐκίνοι τὴν προσήκουσαν δίκην ὑ[πο]πόχωσι.'

'I now give orders generally with regard to all payments to the government made in any manner either actual or by credit, whether in kind or in money or in bodily labour or any other way whatsoever, that payer and payee shall mutually give receipts; and I will punish anyone who acts in any other manner than that hereby directed. Since, moreover, some have complained that though they present their accounts to their creditors the latter are unwilling to accept payment from them in order that they may be induced by the fear of incurring penalties to buy off the delay, those who are thus prevented from paying shall be allowed to give evidence concerning those who refuse to accept, so that they may pay the fitting penalty for their disobedience.'

The passage, as the editors point out, is somewhat obscure, but its main drift shows that those who were unfortunate enough to have dealings with such officials had to choose between two evils—either to submit to extortion, or to suffer the penalties to which they were liable if the payment was not made within the prescribed time.

It is not impossible that some such method as this was resorted to by the publicans of Palestine who were told by Christ to exact no more than that which was appointed them.

THOMAS HARPER.

Glasgow.

The Life of Lord Bute.

MAY I point out that the Presbyterian nobleman who promised his support to Lord Bute's scheme of restoring St. Andrews Cathedral was *not*, as your reviewer assumes, Lord Overtoun, but the then Earl of Moray.

I take this opportunity of thanking you for your kind and appreciative notice of my book; although I do not think your reviewer justified in his conclusion that Lord Bute did not possess 'the sinner's sense of pardon,' nor the 'mystic fellowship of the Spirit.' I venture, on the contrary, to assert that he possessed them both, and in a high degree. I could wish that your critic had quoted, for the benefit of the readers of your journal, the opinion of Lord Bute held and expressed by one of his Presbyterian neighbours: 'He was a Bible-loving man, and very religious.'

DAVID O. HUNTER BLAIR.

S. Paulo, Brazil.

The Khabiri.

WHEN the cuneiform inscriptions of Tel el-Amarna were discovered certain scholars, with more philological learning than historical feeling, rushed to the conclusion that they were the Hebrews of the Old Testament. From the outset I protested against this idea and maintained that they denoted a body of mercenary troops, perhaps of Beduin origin. I further pointed out that the word *Khabiri*, though West Semitic and not Assyrian, is found in an inscription of Assurnazir-pal, and that it signified 'confederates' or 'allies.'

Recent discoveries have settled the question as to who the Khabiri were, and have shown that I was right in my main contentions. The Khabiri were mercenaries who formed the body-guard of the chief sovereigns of Western Asia. They are already mentioned by Rim-Sin, the Elamite adversary of Khammurabi or Amraphel, as Dr. Scheil was the first to discover, and it is possible that the Elamite tribe of Khabirâ, of whom we hear in later times, derived their name from them. They were foreigners in Babylonia, but no Beduin were likely to be among them, the Beduin being too undisciplined and cowardly to have been employed as a royal body-guard.

Ideographically their name was written 'SA-GAZ—that is to say, the Assyrian *sagisi*, 'the slayers' or 'murderers.' We hear a good deal about them in the Hittite tablets of Boghaz-Keui, where they occupy a prominent position. In the treaties made by the Hittite kings with foreign powers and written in Assyrian 'the gods' of the Lulakhkhi and Khabiri are invoked along with the gods of the Hittites themselves, and the texts written in the Hittite language associate the 'Khâbiriya's,' as they are called, with the soldiers, priests, and judges attached to the palace (so in *Hittite Texts in the Cuneiform Character in the British Museum*, 18. 13-18). In one passage we are told that there were 600 Khabiri on guard in one temple and 600 in a second temple (*Hittite Texts*, 37. 4, 5). The Khabiri of whom we hear in the Tel el-Amarna letters will have been some of these mercenaries who served as a body-guard to the Hittite governors of the Canaanite cities. The name may be translated 'Allies,' and 'the district of the Khabiri' (*Khabiri-Ki*) mentioned by the king of Jerusalem (Knudtzon, *El-Amarna Tafeln*, 289. 24) is, I

believe, Hebron south of Jerusalem, the other name of which was Kirjath-Arba. Their later representatives continued to exist in Asia Minor down to the Roman age. In Lydia they were called Tralleis or Astralliai which, according to Hesychius, was the name given to the royal mercenaries because they carried out 'the murderous orders' of the kings.

We learn from a tablet discovered by the German excavators of Assur that there was a god Khabiru (*Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts*, 42. ii. 9), in whom we may see the repre-

sentative of the Khabiri. I believe that we have here the origin of the Greek Kabeiri. The Kabeiri came from Asia Minor and were the 'protectors' and 'defenders,' like the Dioskouri, of the country and its inhabitants. One of them bore the name of Kasmilos, who must be the Hittite god Khasamilis, 'the Swords-man,' the special 'protector' of King Mursilis. The Kabeiri, we are further told, were all descended from Hephæstos, the god of metallurgy and work in armour.

A. H. SAYCE.

Oxford.

Entre Nous.

A TEXT.

A NEW and notable commentary on the Book of Hosea has appeared, under the title of *The Message of Hosea* (S.P.C.K.; 8s. 6d. net). The author is the Rev. Melville Scott, D.D., Prebendary of Lichfield Cathedral.

The last great commentary on Hosea was that of President Harper in the 'International Critical' series. To that book Dr. Scott does the honour of approbation and the greater honour of constant criticism. He holds that neither that nor any hitherto published commentary on Hosea can be satisfactory, for no commentator had made the discovery which he has made, a discovery which renders the first three chapters at last intelligible. That discovery is that *the whole of the third chapter should be inserted bodily between verses 9 and 10 of chapter i.* Try it and see.

But Dr. Scott does more for Hosea than that. Steering a careful middle course between the editor to whom the Massoretic text is inviolable and the editor who 'in a single passage containing fourteen words actually makes no less than ten alterations!' he offers a new text and a new translation. The text and translation are then defended in a series of most interesting notes. One of these notes we proceed to quote:

Hosea ix. 6.

'For, lo, they are gone away from destruction, yet Egypt shall gather them up, Memphis shall

bury them: their pleasant things of silver, nettles shall possess them.—R.V.

'The first indication that all is not right here is the defective parallelism, by which Egypt, the whole country, is opposed to Memphis, a single town in the same country. Much more serious is the strange phrase translated (A.V.) "their pleasant *places* for their silver," the word "places," surely an absolutely essential word, being interpolated by the translators. The R.V. is no better, "their pleasant things of silver" (the word "things" being also interpolated, though without indication) being obviously very doubtful both in sense and also in grammar, for the preposition ὅ is most inadequately translated by "of." This phrase is sufficient in itself to cast suspicion upon the passage, and probably would have done so had this rendering not seemed inevitable. It is very strange that under these circumstances the Commentators seem to have made no reference to the LXX., which reads as follows:—

πορεύονται ἐκ ταλαιπωρίας Αἰγύπτου,
καὶ ἐκδέξεται αὐτοὺς Μέμφις
καὶ θάψει αὐτοὺς Μαχμάς.
τὸ ἀργύριον αὐτῶν, κ.τ.λ.

Here we first notice that Egypt is no longer in parallelism with Memphis, but goes with the previous sentence. The LXX. takes it as a genitive depending on "destruction," but it is, of course, to be taken as the accusative of place—"they flee from destruction to Egypt." The verb

"shall gather them up," which made very poor sense when joined with Egypt, now of course goes as the LXX. indicates with Memphis.

'But we cannot leave Memphis standing without a parallelism, and we need a nominative to the verb "shall bury them." The LXX. finds this nominative by taking the word "Machmad" from the following verse, and taking it as a proper name, which it Grecizes into "Machmas." It will be noticed that this is merely a matter of punctuation, neither the vowels nor the consonants suffering any change. The translation of the passage as emended from the LXX. will thus be—

"Wherefore, behold, they flee from destruction to Egypt,
Yet Memphis shall gather them up,
And Machmad shall bury them."

'Nothing could be better than this: at one and the same time the parallelism is improved, and the strange phrase "their pleasant things (or places) of silver" disappears. The sentence which follows is also much improved, and the preposition χ obtains its natural sense. "As for their silver articles, nettles shall possess them." All these considerations are in favour of this emendation. Its adoption must, however, depend upon evidence of quite another character. If no such place as Machmad were known, the rendering would no doubt be ascribed to the blunder of one of the LXX. translators, even though such a mistake would be very strange in a writer, who, however incompetent as a grammarian, must surely be presumed to have possessed an adequate knowledge of the very country for the inhabitants of which the LXX. translation was being made. There were, however, two towns bearing the name Machmad or Machomades, the one on the Greater Syrtis, the other on the Lesser Syrtis. That on the Greater Syrtis seems the more probable, as being nearer to Palestine. Now, a fugitive from Palestine, driven as the context suggests by hunger, and journeying by land, might well be intercepted by Memphis, and gathered into one of the cemeteries of the city of tombs. But if, in order to avoid this fate, he should elect to go by sea, he might well be driven from his course, and be wrecked off Machomades, and buried in the quicksands of the Syrtis Major, a fate which must have frequently overtaken Jewish sailors. Thus Memphis and Machmad (the alliteration is pecu-

liarly Hosean) become the Scylla and Charybdis between which the Jewish emigrant must perforce choose, and as he must go either by land or by sea, his fate would be certain either way. The main argument in favour of this rendering is the almost infinite improbability against there being such a place as Machmad, and such a Hebrew word as Machmad, if the two are not to be considered as identical.'

SOME TOPICS.

Theobiography.

Mr. Lewis Spence has done as much as any man we know to popularize the scientific study of religion. It is true, his work has been done almost entirely on mythology, but then to him and to every one who studies the matter uncommitted to theories, mythology is religion. It may be rude enough religion, and yet it is all the religion that many persons in modern civilized English society seem to have. It may be debased religion, or it may be religion on the way to higher things, but it is religion. Mr. Spence insists on that, and rightly.

His latest volume is *An Introduction to Mythology* (Harrap; 12s. 6d. net). All the characteristics of careful research, clear order, and candid statement are in it. And there are also in it many strange things, products of that strange thing the human mind. The most original part, and we think the most useful, is the long story of the Progress of Mythic Science. It is a biographical history of the subject, each contributor to progress being taken up separately and his contribution criticized.

Among the rest, Robertson Smith. And here Mr. Spence uses the word 'theobiography,' apparently coining it for his purpose. For he says: 'This appears to the author a suitable term for those bodies of myth which deal exclusively with the lives and adventures of the gods, and differ therefore so strikingly from all other classes of myth.' This is what he then says about theobiography: 'Robertson Smith is undoubtedly correct in his statement that myth takes the place of dogma in primitive religion—that "the sacred lore of priests and people . . . assumes the form of stories about the gods." But having thus connected theobiography with religion and the religious spirit, it is difficult to discover why he denies a

religious character to myth. "These stories," he says (p. 17), "afford the only explanation that is offered of the precepts of religion and the prescribed rules of ritual." If that be the case, surely the group of myths which detail the deeds of the chief deities is of prime importance to religion. The "story" of a religion is its most precious asset. It is from the "story" of their faith that the majority of people receive their ideas concerning it. What would Mohammedanism be without the story of the Prophet? What Buddhism without the tale of Gautama? What Christianity without the life of Christ? And if the argument applies to the higher forms of religion, it may surely be applied, and more so, to primitive faiths. Among savage or barbarous peoples the myth, the body of tales which circles round the gods, is universal tribal property. It takes the place of written scripture, it infuses all poetry and epic, it is represented in sacred drama, it is recited by the neophytes for the priesthood, it underlies the most sacred mysteries. The contention that myth was "no essential part of ancient religion" is based upon a fundamental misconception of the spoken or written story of the gods. In the present writer's view myth is a most important element of primitive religion; for whereas ritual often impresses an alien people as magical and therefore inimical, and is not so readily borrowed, the wide transmission of myth proves that it not only impresses the imagination of the races among whom it has origin, but that it is able to take hold of neighbouring and even distant peoples as well.¹

The Dux.

"The thirst for knowledge was general and the scholars of all ages. In a remote Highland glen, Leishman found a reading lesson in progress from the Book of *Proverbs*. A venerable grey-haired Celt sat *dux*, next to him a very small girl dissolved in tears, who gave as her reason: "Please sir, I ha'e trappit my grandfather and he'll no' let me up."¹

NEW POETRY.

Louis Golding.

One of the poems which Mr. Louis Golding contributed to one of the periodicals was entitled

¹ *Matthew Leishman of Govan*, p. 185.

Shepherd Singing Ragtime, and that has been chosen by him as the title of his latest volume of poetry (Christophers). The poem is as whimsical as the title. And it is not alone in its whimsicality. It would be easy for the careless reader to conclude that this poet has no seriousness in him. And the conclusion would be utterly astray. This, for example, is serious enough and awakening:

UNNAMED FRUIT.

What fruit grows viewless in my garden plot,
So red the sun is shamed,
Tipped with green starshine and with opal
flamed!
Days shall not rot
My fruit so sacred that it is not named.

Not with a carnal lip shalt thou devour
A pulp so tragic-sweet.
For here the juices of disaster meet
When silly power
Gives form to fancy that a man might eat.

Leave us a single tree of precious fruit;
One dream to be our own;
One shape which shall not stammer into stone;
One sweet song mute
To sing with fleshless lips when flesh is flown.

Sundaramūrti Swāmi.

Hymns of the Tamil Śaivite Saints have been translated into English by F. Kingsbury, B.A., and G. E. Phillips, M.A., both of the United Theological College, Bangalore (Oxford University Press; 2s. 6d. net). The volume belongs to the 'Heritage of India' series. 'Englishmen,' say the translators, 'are wanting to understand India more than they ever wanted before, for their debt to India is heavy. Indians are wanting more than ever before to know the wonderful past of their own country, and the wonder of it is all bound up with its religion. At such a time these hymns are worth looking into, for they are being sung in temples and homes throughout the Tamil country, and Tamil is the mother-tongue of more than eighteen millions of people. For pious Śaivites

they equal in authority the Sanskrit Vedas; the mere learning of them by rote is held to be a virtue, and devout Tamil parents compel their children to memorize them in much the same way as Christian parents make their children learn the Psalms.'

The hymns translated are by Sambandar, Apparswāmi, Sundaramūrti, and Mānikka Vāsahar. This short and fairly representative hymn (though representation is not really possible) is by Sundaramūrti:

Our life is all unreal,
Its end is only dust,
Out of the sea of birth
Come ruin, pain and lust.
Delay not to do good
But praise Ketāram's king,
Whom Vishṇu and great Brahm
Vainly sought sorrowing.

A. St. John Adcock.

The volume entitled *Exit Homo* (Selwyn & Blount; 3s. 6d. net) contains a single poem divided into twelve cantos. It is a poem of doubt. Mr. Adcock is an agnostic. But he does not enjoy the comfortable assurance of the Huxley agnostic. He would have faith if he knew where to find it. He is looking in the wrong place for it. He is looking to Lazarus and not to Christ. In the whole long poem there is nothing more significant than the Prelude, on

THE TRAVELLER WHO RETURNED.

When from the grave, where shrouded he had lain,
Lazarus came back to dwell on earth again,
Having, the record says,
Been dead for certain days,
His neighbours, simple men,
Besought him now and then
To tell them, each in secret and alone,
What in his absence from them he had known.

And Lazarus smiling, wistful to confide,
'I only know that death is life,' replied,
'Though nothing now at all
Save that I can recall,

And am, indeed, as one
Who looks upon the sun
Then turning, dazed and blinded by the sight,
Knows, in his darkness, that he saw the light.'

'Nay, but,' they answered, hungering for a sign,

'If you had waked in any world divine,
Had entered any place
Of terror or of grace,
Of suffering or of bliss,
You would remember this;
For no man could forget, whate'er befell,
His first tremendous glimpse of heaven or hell.'

But Lazarus, strangely wiser, smiled content:
'How many a night in slumber, here, I spent,
To wake when morning gleamed
Forgetting all I dreamed,
How many lay,' he said,
'Insensate, yet not dead—
Tell me, where was I when, the long night
through,
Sleep took me thus from all the life I knew?'

Mr. Adcock believes in God, but the God he believes in is a force and nothing more. He speaks of God as *It*, yet attributes to this *It* everything that belongs to personality:

I feel the best and worst that are in man
Are parts of Its unalterable plan;
That we and all things live
Utterly by Its fixed and wise decree,
And that we do, whate'er our lives may be,
Nothing that needs reward, and nothing to for-
give.

Much of the poem is given to criticism of contemporary society, and it is scathing enough. But no distinction is made between Christian and pagan, in art, in letters, or in life. Society is treated as if it were Christian throughout, and Christianity is credited with its foolishness. Thus:

Our newest novelists are much too young
And much too serious to rank among

Mere story-tellers; all their pride consists
In being known as psycho-analysts,
They must adapt, so runs their fond conviction,

The practice of the clinic ward to fiction
And, to restrict their skill to either loth,
Blend art with science, and are quacks in both:
They write for adult readers tales of sex,
Write crudely of raw passions that perplex
Their naively youthful thoughts—their fancies range

Over stale problems that seem new and strange
To them, yet were as old
As life, and had been hot and had gone cold,
When George Moore deftly used them as a crux
In week-day stories for Victorian bucks.

What, then, does Mr. Adcock believe?—

It is my dream, my faith, my only creed,
That all the clue we need
To life hereafter lives within ourselves,
That whosoever delves
Into his secret self and listens there
To knowledge that he learned he knows not where,

To voices speaking through his groping thought
Of things he was not taught,
To instincts native in him, that were born
In the first man who looked on his first morn,
But have been dulled and silenced in the strife
And noise of the world's multitudinous life:
Whoever yields his trust to this intense
Inheritance of spiritual sense

Knows that, as seeds strain up towards the light,
The soul within its night
Of flesh still yearns as it has ever done
To the Beyond and, reassured though blind,
Proves the eternity it seeks to find.
Could the seeds yearn to the light if there was none?

John Galsworthy.

A single poem, beautifully printed, is the contents of *The Bells of Peace* (Heffer; 1s. net). But

the poet is John Galsworthy. We quote the last two verses:

Here in the sunlight and the bracken green—
Wild happy roses starring every lane—
Eager to reach the good that might have been,
They *were* at peace. Are they at peace again?

Bells of remembrance, on this summer eve
Of our relief, Peace and Goodwill ring in!
Ring out the Past, and let not Hate bereave
Our dreaming dead of all they died to win!

Clara Belle Baker.

Songs for the Little Child (Abingdon Press; \$1) is the title of a volume of nursery rhymes composed or adapted and set to music by Clara Belle Baker, Teacher of English and of Primary Curriculum in the National Kindergarten and Elementary College, Chicago. Here is one of them, music and all:

Pret-ty pus-sy, mew, mew, mew. I can guess what trou-bles you:

You are ver-y tired of play-ing, You are hun-gry, so you're say-ing.

Pret-ty pus-sy, mew, mew, mew, I'll soon have some milk for you.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.